DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 043 SP 005 277

AUTHOR Mackenzie, Gordon N.; And Others

TITLE Educational Resources Center. Board of Education, District of Columbia.

INSTITUTION District of Columbia Board of Education, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 68

NOTE 117p.; Evaluation for the Period April 1, 1967-August 31, 1968

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; Curriculum Development; *Educational Resources; Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Resource Centers

IDENTIFIERS District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The major activities of the Education Resources Center (ERC) thus far have included inservice training, innovative curriculum development, and operation as a professional center for teachers. The inservice training consisted of a variety of workshops, institutes, and seminars on educational technology and individualized instruction which served about 6,448 teachers and administrators between April 1967 and September 1968. Curriculum development involved letting contracts to master teachers during the summer of 1967 and 1968 to write curriculum guides. As a professional center, the ERC had about 1,800 visitors from March 1 to October 31, 1968. Evaluation of the ERC included interviews with and questionnaires directed to personnel at the building level and interviews with administrative and supervisory personnel. (Copies of the questionnaires and an interview outline are included.) The evaluators agreed with the general consensus that the ERC is much needed and should be continued and extended. However, it was felt that the Center was "spreading itself too thin" in attempting to provide training, curriculum development, and services. It was recommended that the role and functions of the Center be more clearly defined. Concern was also expressed about coordination with individual schools and availability of materials. (RT)

ED055043

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER

BOARD OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Title III of the Elementary and Secondary
Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation for the Period

April 1, 1967 - August 31, 1968

Gordon N. Mackenzie

Marvin Sontag

David E. Wilder

SP005277

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Topic	Page
Preface	iii
Part I - The Setting	
Initial Plans for the Center	1
The Evaluation Plan	3
Plan of this Report	4
Part II - Chronology of Development: Influences and Events in the Center's Development	6
Early Planning and Changes in Plans	6
Major Program Activities - Spring and Summer 1967	12
The 1967-68 School Year	19
The Summer Program, 1968	24
Summary	26
Part III - Evaluations by School Personnel	29
Responses from the Building Level	29
Interviews with Administrative and Supervisory Personnel	36
Part IV - Interpretations and Recommendations	42
Appendix 1 - Excerpts from Application for Federal Grant to Establish, Operate and Maintain a Supplementary Educational Center and Services	48
Appendix 2 - Excerpts from Contract No. 6871 Between the Government of the District of Columbia and Gordon N. Mackenzie, Marvin Sontag and David E. Wilder Covering the Period of April 1, 1967 to August 31, 1968	54

Topic Page

Appendix 3 - Questionnaires to Teachers and Principals 57

Appendix 4 - Central Staff - Interview Schedule 67

Appendix 5 - Supporting Comments, Teacher and Principal Questionnaires 70

Appendix 6 - Teacher Responses to Passow Study Questionnaire 111

Preface

The directors of this evaluation have been aided immeasurably by the unusual cooperation of those associated with the Educational Resources Center: Dr. Mildred Cooper, General Research, Budget and Legislation; Mrs. Lu Verne C. Walker, Director, Curriculum; Mr. Thomas Mc Manus, Director, Educational Resources Center; and Messers Otello Meucci and James Taylor, Deputy Directors, Educational Resources Center.

Models and methods for evaluating organizational units are still in their infancy in spite of the great stimulus in recent years of the United States Office of Education in this direction. The intent, of course, is that the approach used here will be useful to all concerned with the future of the Center. But, beyond that there may be genuine gains if this report generates criticism and discussion of alternate and productive approaches in the assessment of other ventures similar to the Educational Resources Center both in their early and later stages.

Gordon N. Mackenzie
Marvin Sontag
David E. Wilder

Part I - The Setting

Initial Plans for the Center

The application for a Federal grant to establish, operate and maintain a supplementary educational center and services indicated two categories of major purposes: (1) in-service education and curriculum development, and (2) educational materials.

The first paragraph of the proposal is as follows:

> The proposed Educational Resources Center will be the principal vehicle through which the District of Columbia Public Schools will provide assistance to public and non-public school teachers relative to their classroom instruction. This assistance will be in the form of in-service education, curriculum development and educational materials(1).

In respect to the first purpose, in-service education and curriculum development (these are combined in the discussion), the intention was to have the Center provide the organization as well as the facilities and materials necessary for a comprehensive in-service education program. The Center was to have "17 in-service and program coordinators, representing all subject fields serving kindergarten through grade 12 and two special fields -- early childhood and special education." These coordinators were to "be responsible for the in-service education of the teachers of his particular field or fields." Each was to "plan and develop the in-service program for his subject field in cooperation with the supervising director of that field." The proposal further indicated that "a second responsibility of the in-service coordinator will be to work with the supervising

(1) "Application for Federal Grant to Establish, Operate and Maintain a Supplementary Educational Center and Services," pp. 2-6.

director in establishing needs for writing courses of study for his subject field and subsequently, to work with individuals designated by the supervising director of the subject field to write a course of study." In further explanation, the application indicated that "The in-service and program coordinators will be responsible for the utilization of the resources of the Center and the participation of teachers in the Center programs for the special field which he represents." The application contemplated a very broad and varied program for the improvement of instruction calculated to meet the needs of over 6500 District of Columbia teachers in a wide range of areas including the utilization of equipment and materials.

As already noted, a second purpose related to educational materials. Excerpts from the application, presented in Appendix 1, indicate the following intentions.

> ... A professional curriculum laboratory will have professional books, periodicals, curriculum bulletins, printed resource materials, and sample textbooks used in schools.
>
> ... A collection of curriculum materials will be designated for each subject area and equipment will be provided in specific areas where it is needed for in-service education and where existing equipment cannot be used.
>
> The educational resources center will also contain a collection of District-approved instructional materials and an exhibit of sample materials which will provide the opportunity for teachers to critically study all materials at first-hand rather than merely selecting at random or using those kinds of titles which seem to be the "style."
>
> The Center will house a collection of special materials for the culturally deprived. ... However, since such materials are scarce, there is need for the development of additional aids and guides. Special curriculum material development will be the responsibility of specialists at the Center.
>
> An extensive educational media department will be an important part of the Center. It will be supplemental to the present audio-visual department which is a well-developed unit but totally inadequate for a system the size of Washington, D. C.

> Another integral part of the Educational Resources Center is the Graphic Arts unit. A two-fold function will be accomplished here; one, will be the in-service education of school staff on the preparation of materials and the use of equipment for reproduction purposes, and two, the actual production of curriculum materials. Presently, within the school system, there is no adequate facility for the production of curriculum materials.

The initial plans included provisions for consultant services of specialists, for substitute service to enable teachers to participate in daytime programs, and for payment to specialists, or to teachers for released time in order that curriculum writing might be facilitated. A further plan provided for a physical facility, of approximately 25,000 square feet, to include conference, meeting, and audio-visual reviewing rooms, a curriculum laboratory, graphic arts and distribution centers, special subject centers, and offices for the Center staff as well as the staff of the Curriculum Department.

The proposal was very explicit in indicating that improved instruction in the District of Columbia public and non-public schools was the goal of the varied increased services and opportunities for teachers which were planned.

Several modifications in the details of these proposals became necessary. Those modifications whose consequences came to the attention of the evaluators will be mentioned at appropriate points in the report. However, the interpretation of the proposal as presented is quite close to the actual operating plan as will be shown.

The Evaluation Plan

The contract provisions covering the plan for evaluation of the Educational Resources Center between April 1, 1967 and August 31, 1968 appear in Appendix 2. The initial intention was to (1) assess changes in teacher or school practice and facilities which might have been influenced by the Center's program; (2) make assessments of products of the Center such as curriculum bulletins; and (3) make informal evaluations as these might relate to the process of change, the personnel involved, organization climate, and other matters. It was recognized that modifications in evaluation plans would be necessary as the Center arrangements became more firm. However, the time involved in establishing the Center, as well as certain changes in direction, were not fully anticipated. As a consequence of these, evaluation plans were modified considerably as will be indicated.

In addition to gathering certain types of interview and questionnaire data to be reported later, the evaluators had regular and substantial meetings with the Director of the Center and/or members of his staff approximately once a month. These were used to secure a running account of major activities and of developments influencing the work of the Center. In addition, several major activities were visited on a sampling basis in an effort to understand better the Center's program and manner of operation.

Plan of this Report

The sections which follow present the observations of the evaluators and the teachers, supervisors and administrators most directly involved. Obviously it is impossible to take into account in a report such as this all of the Center's activities and all of the influences shaping them. Presumably reports prepared by the Center will catalogue these more fully. However, there has been an attempt to treat in the separate sections which follow, three major topics:

1. In Part II, the chronological development of the Center and some influences and events which came to the attention of the evaluators as being particularily important.

2. In Part III, evaluations by school personnel at both the building and the District of Columbia level.

3. In Part IV, interpretations and recommendations.

Part II - Chronology of Development: Influences and Events in the Center's Development

Any reasonable appraisal of the Center's program during its first year necessarily takes into account a variety of factors which influenced its birth and early development. While all of these cannot be reported here, some of those which came to the attention of the evaluators can be indicated in an effort to explain and interpret many subsequent developments.

Early Planning and Changes in Plans

Much of the initiative and early direction of planning for the Educational Resources Center emerged from the Division of General Research, Budget and Legislation which carried much of the early initiative as well as subsequent over-sight of the project.

The Educational Resources Center, subsequently to be referred to either as the ERC or the Center was created in response to a widely recognized need of an over-all organization and plan for in-service education in the District of Columbia Schools. Needs were systematically canvassed and in-service education and curriculum development were reported to be most frequently mentioned by those consulted.

A wide range of individuals and agencies participated in planning. Supervisory directors, many of whom, under the District School organization, operate quite independently in respect to various subject areas, were brought together for many meetings. Other public school officers and teachers from the District schools and from independent and parochial schools, as well as representatives of universities and of business and industry were consulted. Almost a year was spent in getting agreement on a proposal. It has been reported that agreement on program specifics presented the major hurdles rather than gross questions of staffing and facilities. It would appear that high expectations and substantial enthusiasms were developed.

Approval was granted for the ERC as a Title III (ESEA) project for the period of October 31, 1966 to November 1, 1967. Later this was extended for another year. There was reported to have been considerable skepticism about this new venture. The approved budget of $404,325.00 was very substantially below the amount originally planned. This is a possible factor in some later misinterpretations and developments which will be reported.

A Director and two Assistant Directors began operation by January, 1967. Temporary and crowded quarters were utilized in the Phillips Building. Early months were occupied with problems of procurement of staff, equipment, and space. The difficulties in working out logistics and tactics were extreme. Several factors contributed to this. The relation of the ERC to the D. C. schools presented problems in view of the lack of an effective organization of the system for the administration of the instructional program. The complications of working through the District of Columbia officials on personnel, space, and budget items presented added delays. The complications of administering a large federally supported project befuddle many hardy souls. The intention here is not to shift responsibility or to blame anyone in particular; rather the purpose is to make clear some of the complicating factors in starting a new venture such as this. These complications are seldom appreciated by anyone not immediately involved, and certainly not by those expecting immediate service from a newly created organizational unit.

The relationship of the ERC to certain Title III and other projects presented problems and demands. Lack of clarity as to function and authority of an organization often leads to a concern with position and status rather than the job to be done. It appears that the ERC staff had some symptoms of this with a further complication of inability to get approval for staff and space. By the late spring of 1967 something of a crisis situation had occurred and the Center had to turn to outside contractors to staff its program. However, before describing this specific activity it appears appropriate to examine the Center's staff thinking relative to purposes and to its relations with other agencies.

A progress report dated May 1, 1967 indicated some restatement of the original purposes as noted on page 1 as well as the extent of the Center staff's desire for involvement with other activities. This is indicated in the excerpts which follow:

> APPROACH:
>
> The Center has a three-pronged approach to the major objectives of improving of pupil learning in the District of Columbia.
>
> 1. The development of innovative curriculum materials
> 2. The introduction of a wide range of the newer educational media
> 3. A direct attack on the improvement in instruction through coordination of the in-service teacher training program
>
> PURPOSES:
>
> The consensus of opinion of the planning groups Supervising Directors, the Superintendent's Staff, and the Advisory Committee of the Center was the commitment of the Center to a central theme: THE UTILIZATION OF THE NEWER MEDIA AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION.

……

PERSONNEL:

The Center is under the educational leadership and overall authority of the Director of Curriculum.

……

The Progress Report of May 1967 listed several projects which have contributed to the capacity and resources of the Center:

1. Arena Stage	In the Tri-School area, an in-service teacher training program in dynamic teaching, using theater techniques.
2. Enrichment through Radio	A language arts enrichment project using the radio broadcasting station of American University.
3. Language Arts Project	A project to prepare innovative curriculum and develop innovative teaching techniques making maximum use of educational technology and inter-disciplinary methodology.
4. "Project Outreach"	A city-wide program of cultural enrichment through music, in cooperation with the U. S. Navy Band.
5. "Negro Heritage Project"	To plan an interdisciplinary resources center on "The Negro Heritage" and to bring the Negro image and the Negro into the mainstream of American culture.
6. "Personal and Family Living Project"	A program of in-service education for counselors and other pupil personnel services staff to develop understanding and skills to deal with students' personal and family living problems.

7. "Smithsonian Tour Guides"	An innovative curriculum oriented series of six Smithsonian Institute tour guides for teachers of grades 5, 8 and 11 in the subject areas of history and science.

In some instances, these projects were coordinated by the Center.

The Educational Resources Center also originated or assisted with the following proposals:

1. A Total Management Information System for the D. C. Public Schools - (Originated) - Proposal completed.
2. Southwest Seminar and Development Project - (Assisted with the formulation of the proposal).
3. Computer Assisted Instruction Project - (In cooperation with the Center for Educational Technology, Catholic University) - Proposal in progress.(2)

This quotation from the report seems to sharpen considerably the initial statement of purpose by indicating an intent to develop "innovative curriculum materials" and to introduce "a wide range of newer educational media." Further, the identification of a central theme, "The utilization of the newer media and educational technology for the improvement of instruction," makes explicit an emphasis which has continued through the summer of 1968 in the in-service activities.

The statements of purpose also related to a commitment to coordinate "a wide variety of community and federal resources of the District of Columbia for the optimum utilization by children and youth." There were other indications from the very beginning of the intention that the Center would utilize the "resources of all appropriate institutions such as the Smithsonian Institute, the Corcoran Art Gallery, and the major universities of the area."

---

(2) Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III, Project 380, Progress Report as of May 1, 1967 (mimeographed).

As a further extension of this, consideration of purposes, and of involvement in other projects, the Center's October 31, 1967 Progress Report states the purpose as follows:

> Purpose
>
> To improve pupil learning in the District of Columbia by serving all school personnel in the areas of:
>
> a. teacher in-service training
> b. innovative curriculum development
> c. providing a central year-round facility for use for professional improvement(3)

This is something of a return to the initial statement of purpose. The emphasis on media is played down, although the concern with media was reflected in many activities.

The October 31, 1967 Progress Report again lists the projects with which the ERC was associated, as in the May report. However, several additions were made. The Southwest Seminar and Development Project for the Tri-School area was reported in some detail. It appears that partially because of staffing problems in this project, the Center staff was asked to contribute in several respects. While this was a very time-consuming activity, it provided among other things a laboratory for ERC staff training and for work with several items of innovative equipment and materials.

---

(3) District of Columbia Educational Resources Center Progress Report as of October 31, 1967 (mimeographed), p. 1.

A second addition in the October 1967 listing is the Washington Integrated Secondary Education (WISE) Project. A continuing relationship with this group has provided a tangible contact with a serious effort to develop a model secondary school program in integrated education.

A third addition in the October 1967 list is the Community School Development Sub-Project - Individualized Instruction in Reading - Four Southwest Elementary Schools. This project permitted staff exploration of the feasibility of the use of technology in the teaching of reading.

The October report makes reference to A Learning Tower/Educational Park System for the D. C. Public Schools and proposals to the Acting Superintendent of Schools concerning individualized instruction and the establishment of Learning Resources Centers in every school (in cooperation with the Director of Curriculum). More will be said of these and other additions later.

Major Program Activities - Spring and Summer 1967

Although the October 31, 1967 report has been mentioned because of its reference to purposes and related projects and activities, it is necessary to turn back to the spring of 1967 crisis. The impossibility of getting staff and space promptly led to the formulation of limited plans for the first year. Much attention was given to establishing the organization, selecting personnel, staff training, location of facilities, selection and purchase of equipment and materials, and during the late spring and summer launching an extensive program of in-service education and innovative curriculum development. The fact that many materials had been procured by the D. C. schools with Title II (ESEA) funds, and which were not being fully used, made this a desirable focus of attention in in-service activities.

The Center for Educational Technology of Catholic University was employed by the Center to establish a program focused basically on instructing principals and two teachers from each school to use the Title II and other audio-visual materials. Certainly this was a major effort of the Center's first year.

The initial program in the series of in-service sessions relating to materials of instruction was a tri-conference of the Educational Resources Center, the Catholic University of America, and the D. C. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development held from April 13 - 19, 1967. These meetings sought to provide an overall orientation for school system managers, officers, teachers and community leaders in the new educational technology. This was followed by series of training sessions:

Date	Type of Training	Approximate Number of Personnel
May	Educational Technology Training for Supervisory teachers and Supervising Directors.	30
June	Educational Technology Training for supervisory teachers and selected teachers.	60
June 12-23	Educational Technology Institute for Supervising Directors and teacher Educational Specialists.	91
June 17-27	Educational Technology Institute special subject teachers.	87
June 19-30	Orientation-In Educational Technology, one day for each teacher in small groups. Part I (see Aug. 8-14 for Part II)	200

Date	Type of Training	Approximate Number of Personnel
July 5 - August 9	A series of five one week Educational Technology Institutes at Catholic University. For principals and assistant principals, elementary and secondary.	90
August 8-14	A series of one day Orientations in Educational Technology; Part II	200

(4)

This series was planned so as to start with administrative and supervisory officers and be followed with meetings for teachers. With two teachers from each building and the principal having been involved, a carry-over effect was hoped for. While no specific training appears to have been given for dissemination, there was initial planning for continued work with supervising directors and selected teachers by the ERC, a follow-up newsletter for those in attendance, and various kinds of continued support. It was the hope that added teachers and principals might be involved at a later date.

Some of these workshop activities were observed, and the evaluations made by the Catholic University staff were submitted to us for examination. In an interim report dated October 7, 1967, we made the following observations:

> ... On June 23 we attended the Workshop at Catholic University. Further, Dr. Wilder attended meetings conducted under the Catholic University Contract on April 28 .... Since our August 15 report we have had an extended meeting on September 20 with the Educational

---

(4) Excerpts from "Report of Training Accomplished and Planned for Public School Personnel," April 14, 1967. Educational Resources Center. (mimeographed).

Resources Center staff to review their summer activities and plans for the coming year. In addition we have examined various documents and reports, a sampling of responses of participants in the summer workshops, and the summary of the evaluations of the workshops, entitled Preliminary Evaluation Report, Summer Institutes and Workshops in Education Technology for District of Columbia Schools, prepared by Center for Educational Technology, the Catholic University of America. ...

The in-service programs under the Center for Educational Technology of Catholic University of America appear to have been well planned and well conceived in respect to the personnel selected and served. The effort to involve staff from all levels of the public school system and the independent schools was excellently arranged.

Due to the late date on which final arrangements were made for the evaluation of the Center, our first contact with the workshops was made after they had begun. At this time we discovered that evaluation questionnaires were being distributed to all participants and felt that it would be unwise to duplicate this effort.

The response to the invitations to participate in the workshop suggests widespread interest and enthusiasm. Apparently both the timing and the focus were appropriate. We base these statements on: (1) an investigation of a sample of the responses; (2) our visit to a number of sessions; and (3) the summer report prepared by the Center for Educational Technology of Catholic University which was mentioned earlier. We commend this report as being extremely fair and impartial. If anything, the authors "bent over backwards" to include negative comments.

The Center for Educational Technology was undoubtedly handicapped by the inadequate time available for planning. They did, however, succeed in assembling talent, physical facilities, and equipment. Further, they produced a program which appeared to hold much interest and stimulation. They instituted regular evaluation procedures with each group through various kinds of reaction forms. An examination of the summaries of the responses of participants suggests that these reaction forms were taken seriously, and that useful feed-back information was provided for guidance in planning other in-service activities.

Much of the planning associated with the follow-up of workshops sponsored by Catholic University was interrupted by new developments growing out of the J. Skelly Wright decision as will be reported later. Some of the consequences of this summer program in terms of reactions of participants will be indicated later in connection with a report on staff reactions to the ERC.

Additional training activities were conducted during the summer of 1967. These included the following:

Date	Type of Training	Approximate Number of Personnel
Aug. 7-18	A Creative Writing Workshop Curriculum Development	14
Aug. 7-18	A Curriculum Development Workshop -- creative procedures in urban education	18
Aug. 14-25	A series of orientation and training sessions in individualizing instruction, attended by principals, supervisory teachers, and teachers of three Southwest area elementary schools.	120
Aug. 21-25	Institute on Micro Teaching for Elementary School supervisory teachers, at Maryland University.	45
Aug. 21-25	Southeast D. C. Elementary School Reading Improvement Workshop. Training for teachers and principals, at Catholic University.	50
Sept. 11-15	Educational Technology Project Evaluation Conference for special subject teachers - 5 groups of 12 teachers, one day for each group.	60

Various kinds of products resulted from these, but products were primarily for the participants. It will be noted that two of these related to projects already mentioned: one in Southwest and the other in Southeast Washington, D. C.

According to the October 31, 1967 Progress Report of the ERC, 1336 individuals were involved in training programs sponsored by the Center between April 13 and October 31, 1967.(5)

A second aspect of the work of the ERC was focused on curriculum development. In addition to the in-service coordinators, the Center had the equivalent of seven salaries for a corps of curriculum writers to facilitate this work. Also some projects had access to other sources of assistance. The major activities most of which were scheduled during the June 26 - August 4 period, follow:

Better Reading Instruction for Rehabilitating the Handicapped
Driver Education
Elementary Art Guide
Home Economics
Innovations
Language Arts
New Approaches in the Teaching of Literature
Orientation Handbook, Secondary Level
Physical Education
Severely Mentally Retarded
Social Studies: Innovative Programs
Wise Humanities Project - English and Social Studies (6)
Wise Project - Reading Improvement (6) (7)

It is probable that one or two additional writing activities were sponsored, but have for some reason been omitted from the source quoted.

In most instances, the ERC's role in these curriculum activities was one

(5) District of Columbia Educational Resources Center Progress Report as of October 31, 1967. (Mimeographed)

(6) Scheduled during August for two or three weeks.

(7) Innovative Curriculum Writing Programs, Summer 1967. (Typed)

of arrangement, general administration, and payment for the writers. These were frequently specialists in some subject area, and worked under the direction of a supervisor, and with the help of one or more consultants. Objectives varied greatly in respect to the scope of these efforts, and two products, at least, were more in the nature of administrative or information bulletins. The actual work was done at various locations throughout the city.

Two products from these workshops appeared promptly, Hello New Adventurers!(8) and Innovations(9). The first of these is an administrative handbook, and the second is a catalogue or information guide. Several other pieces of material were seen in draft form such as the one on Driver Education(10).

The intention was to have an evaluation of each curriculum bulletin by outside specialists, as well as by users, for inclusion in this report. Much of the material developed during the summer of 1967 was probably used on a trial basis in classrooms. However, the diverse sources of major responsibility and concern probably made it difficult for the ERC staff to have continuing information relative to each project they had sponsored. A careful check with ERC staff in May of 1968 revealed only one bulletin, Compensatory Program in Language Arts English, Guide for Grade 10(11), which was ready for distribution to the schools. It was to be sent out for trial

(8) A Handbook of Helpful Information for the Teacher of the Secondary School Level, Curriculum Department, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1967.

(9) Innovations in Instruction, Capsule Reviews, Washington, D. C. Public Schools, 1967 Supplement.

(10) Driver Education, Curriculum Resource Bulletin for High Schools, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1967.

(11) Compensatory Program in Language Arts, English Guide for Grade 10 . For experimental use beginning September, 1967, Washington, D. C.

in September, 1968. The time required for writing, editing and securing approvals on curriculum bulletins, even if they are only for experimental use, is often greater than is generally recognized.

The 1967-68 School Year

During the first few months of the Center's operation, the D. C. schools were in something of a period of crisis and uncertainty. Within the District of Columbia there were many educational critics and protesters, as well as numerous agencies and individuals trying to assist the schools. A major comprehensive study of the school system was being conducted by an outside agency, and prospects for change and reorganization were being verbalized.

However, by the summer of 1967 the J. Skelly Wright Decision called for an immediate and drastic reorganization with its outlawing of the track system. The associated resignation of the superintendent of schools, the ultimate appointment of a new superintendent, and continued uncertainty throughout the 1967-68 school year relative to the organization of the school system had drastic influences on the ERC and its program.

By early fall of 1967 the staffing of the Center was completed with the designation of seven coordinators and a new deputy director. This was a drastic cut from the 17 coordinators initially expected. The revised plan was to have each coordinator represent three fields. This, of course, created complications and made impossible the appointment of individuals with leadership competence in each of the areas which a single individual was to service and made difficult the securing of respect and support from the personnel representing each and all of the various subject-matter departments with which an individual coordinator would have to work. The new Deputy Director was named for Administration and Coordination of Curriculum Development

Activities. This position paralleled that of Deputy Director for Innovation, In-service Education, and Training.

There were several other major developments during the 1967-68 year which will be described briefly as a basis for later evaluative and interpretive comments.

The Board of Education in the District of Columbia moved immediately to comply with the J. Skelly Wright Decision. Although plans for the fall term had been completed, action was taken to abolish the tracking system by the September, 1967 opening of school. The Department of Curriculum and its Educational Media Center and Library Department, as well as the ERC and other agencies responded to requests from the school administration and turned attention to the development of a program of individualized instruction. The ERC sought to play a major role in this effort and directed much time and attention to the problems presented. Mimeographed materials were prepared by the Curriculum Department and the ERC indicating various steps which could be taken at system-wide, building, and classroom levels to implement the new program. An Ad Hoc Committee developed plans for "A Learning Resources Center in Every Building."

The ERC moved vigorously to support this program on a general basis as well as with specific activities. Massive in-service programs on individualization were seen as being needed. Individualized instruction, and learning resources centers in each building were central to the Center's interest in technology and the plans which it had developed for the Technological Improvement of the District of Columbia Schools (Learning Towers)(12). The development of behavioral objectives and of learning packages was seen as an important

(12) A Comprehensive Plan for the Technological Improvement of the District of Columbia Public Schools. (mimeographed)

means for furthering individualization. For the whole year of 1967-68 much of the effort of the Center dealt with implementing the individualized instruction ideas. Supplementary budget proposals for 1968, and budgets for 1969 and for 1970 substantiated this concern and also represented major efforts to expand the ERC program. The pressure of the new developments during the early months of the 1967-68 year was such that there was no opportunity to follow through on the many plans which had been made for a follow-up on the 1967 spring and summer technology workshops until the summer of 1968.

The Southwest Seminar (Project 470, ESEA Title III) provided one of several major focal points on laboratories. Working through planning sessions in August of 1967, orientation and training sessions with teachers, and the securing of new equipment and materials, a year-long effort was made to see what could be done to individualize the program. Work was started on behavioral objectives as a prelude to developing learning packages. This influenced the summer program of 1968. As indicated elsewhere, the Center's administration regarded the Southwest Seminar Project as an important laboratory and training center for the ERC staff.

The "Development of Community Schools, Sub-program -- Individualized Instruction"(13) was a similar activity with three public and one parochial school in Southeast Washington.

In cooperation with the District Teachers College, several centers were established for in-service education. Each center had a small staff and in this activity the ERC coordinators played an important role. Participants within classes sometimes broke into subject and grade-level groups and work was started on instructional objectives. After the Center's new physical facilities became available, meetings were often scheduled there.

---

(13) Mimeographed outline of plans for determining the feasibility of related education technology in the teaching of reading.

These activities with the Southwest Seminar, with the Development of Community Schools, and with District of Columbia Teachers College are merely illustrative of a wide range of activities in which the Center cooperated.

The development of a physical space to house equipment and to provide for offices and training activities was a very time-consuming and complicated activity.

The occupancy of adequate quarters in the Bureau of National Affairs Building was delayed until March 1, 1968. The absence, for over a year, of a professional center for teachers handicapped program efforts. The new building made possible a curriculum laboratory, an educational media laboratory, an exhibit area, a printing facility and flexible conference rooms and training stations.

The new facility did much to influence both the activities and the image of the Center. However, many weeks were involved in getting equipment and materials properly placed and located, and it wasn't until late spring that open-house sessions were scheduled and invitations issued to school personnel to come, visit, and browse in the curriculum and educational media laboratories and to consult with program coordinators.

The evaluators made serious efforts to study the activities of the coordinators. Interviews were conducted with most of them and logs of their activities were requested. Apparently considerable time was involved in clarifying their roles and functions, and in working out their relationships with their counterparts among the supervising directors. Nevertheless, program coordinators did engage in a wide range of activities during their first year. As has already been noted, the coordinators did participate in some of the courses sponsored by the District of Columbia Teachers College.

Some staff members were involved in the Southwest Seminar Program and the Southeast Reading Project. They responded to numerous requests from individual teachers, principals, supervisors, and building units. They cooperated with supervising directors in their programs on request. Some were sent to special training activities. Much that they did was viewed by the Center's administrative staff as preparation for their own summer of 1968 program.

Coordinators also responded to many requests for assistance on a variety of projects at the Center. For example, a set of scripts to accompany slides depicting selected activities of the Center were prepared for a presentation to the Board of Education. Following the opening of the Center much time was given to visitors and to informing them of the possible uses of the Center. Late in the school year the first issue of a newsletter announcing various Center activities was distributed widely in the school system.

Some time was given to the preparation of materials for use in summer in-service and curriculum programs as well as in other activities which would lead toward individualization of instruction. A hope, expressed repeatedly and in many ways, was for the development of instructional objectives in every subject area for kindergarten through grade 12 and the subsequent preparation of work packages or contracts. (This appeared to the evaluators to be only slightly related to much of the work going forward under the direction of others in the various subject-fields.) However, the Center kept stressing this idea, and to implement it a budget request was prepared proposing a curriculum specialist and a supervisor of in-service activities in each building. This request was not honored.

The Summer Program, 1968

By the spring of 1968, staff arrangements, physical facilities, equipment and materials were such as to make possible the planning of a full-scale summer program. Two lines of activity were followed: curriculum development and in-service education. Each will be described briefly.

Innovative curriculum development programs were coordinated by the Center's Deputy Director for Administration and Curriculum during the period of July 1 to August 13. These included: (1) two projects in the social studies, one at the elementary and another at the secondary level; (2) two projects in secondary English; (3) one project in mathematics; and (4) two projects in business education. These were set up in cooperation with the supervising directors of the various subject fields and of elementary education. The supervising directors designated teachers to work on these projects and in some instances one or two teachers for each project group were designated by the Deputy Director.

The usual target was a plan for a semester's work, or a special unit or topic new to the program. While the Center stressed behavioral objectives and learning packages, the teacher participants were reported to have been more interested in new materials relating to the topic on which they were working. Curriculum materials developed were to be submitted to the supervising director concerned, tried out on a limited basis, and then revised before being issued for general use.

The Center's contribution to this program was of several types. Consultant fees and writers' salaries were provided. The Center's program coordinators were available for assistance. Administrative planning and coordinating by the Center afforded the necessary over-sight. Presumably the Center will provide released time for participants to return for work on later evaluations and revisions of the material developed during the summer.

The Center apparently hopes to extend these activities another year. The 1968 summer's activity was apparently limited by the funds available for writers' salaries. A hope was expressed that in the future, attention might be directed to an arts and humanities program and to the development of behavioral objectives for the regular on-going curriculum.

A similar and related project was carried on in cooperation with the WISE Project. Here the focus was "An Interdisciplinary Approach to English and Social Studies" and "Humanities," an interdisciplinary appraoch through art, literature, music, drama, and social studies.

Running parallel to curriculum development activities were major summer in-service program activities. These included: (1) two one-day sessions for elementary school principals as a follow-up on the previous year's activity with recommendations for working with teachers; (2) two one-day sessions with elementary school teachers as a follow-up on the 1967 summer's media and materials workshop with suggestions for individualizing instruction and learning; (3) five one-week training sessions for elementary school teachers on individualizing instruction. The teachers were designated by their principals and had not participated during the 1967 summer workshops.

The one-week training sessions just mentioned focused on diagnosing pupil strengths and weaknesses, writing behavioral objectives, creating learning packages and using appropriate media and material. Programs were carefully prepared by the staff group to provide for direct instruction, experience with various media and materials, contact with outside consultants and assistance. Over 250 of the 333 in attendance volunteered to return during the 1968-69 school year to work on learning strategies and packages.

The Center's Deputy Director for Innovation, In-service Education and Training coordinated these programs with the assistance of the program coordinators. The Center provided stipends of $15.00 per day for teachers. These were clearly Center planned and directed activities and made full use of the Center's staff and facilities.

In addition to these Center in-service programs, other agencies in and out of the school system were assisted. These included one-day seminars for the Peace Corps, the Urban Service Corps, and teachers and administrators of adult education. Also, support was provided for a two-day training session for 400 teachers, conducted by the Department of Elementary Supervision and Instruction.

Summary

Thus far, the description of the Educational Resources Center development and program has been somewhat chronological with illustrations given of types of programs and problems. The intent was to provide a background for evaluations and recommendations to be made in a later section. It may be useful here, to focus on the major activities of the Center and to indicate more clearly the nature and extent of its contacts with or for the school system.

1. In-service training

A great variety of orientation sessions, workshops, institutes, seminars and one-day sessions were held from April 1967 through September 1968. Many of these dealt with educational technology or with individualized instruction. They included activities sponsored by the Center alone or in cooperation with neighboring universities, the District of Columbia Teachers College, or segments of the public, independent, and parochial schools. The Center estimates that 6,448 participated in these programs.(14) The number of in-service education participants during the second year of the Center was over four times that of the first year.

2. Innovative curriculum development

   A substantial range of curriculum development efforts has already been reported. These occurred primarily during the summers of 1967 and 1968. The Center has served mainly as an administrator or facilitator of these projects. Most of them are still in process.

3. A professional center

   Since March 1, 1968, the ERC has operated a professional center for teachers, as already described. This has provided advisory services, materials, and phsyical facilities which have been increasingly available and used. The Center estimates 1800 visitors from March 1 to October 31, 1968.(15)

---

(14) An Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III, Project Report on The District of Columbia Educational Resources Center (For the period January 1, 1967 through October 31, 1968), page 9. (Mimeographed)

(15) Ibid., p. 9.

4. Service to other projects

The Center has worked cooperatively with supervising directors, with various units of the District School System, with independent and parochial schools, and with the District Teachers College as has been noted. However, the extent of the service rendered to various ESEA Title I and Title III projects, as well as to other educational and community projects may not have been fully reflected in the report as given. There have been at least eight of these in which the relationship has been largely one of mutual exchange and cooperation. There are at least two in which major staff investments have been involved.

5. Special requests

As is natural in any large educational organization, units with special skills are called on for reports, analyses, or proposals on problems relating to these specialities. The Center staff has been very active in submitting proposals relating to educational technology, individualizing instruction, and special kinds of school facilities. This has involved major time commitments and must be viewed as a part of the total product of the Center.

Part III - Evaluations by School Personnel

This section reports data of two types: (1) interviews with, and results of questionnaires directed to personnel at the building level, and (2) interviews with administrative and supervisory personnel.

Responses from the Building Level

A series of interviews was conducted by the three study directors with selected school personnel in several schools during the winter months of 1967-68. Those interviewed at each school included the principal, the librarian, and whatever additional personnel were involved in Center-related activities. The purpose of these interviews was to gain a sense of the awareness of the ERC and its activities as experienced at the school level and to assess the extent to which there had been any attempt to implement Center-sponsored programs, such as having a resources center in every school.

It became clear from these initial interviews that there was general awareness among the principals of the existence of the Center, and that some efforts had been made to establish individual resources centers in the schools. Usually the librarian was in charge of these efforts in schools that had started their own centers, materials were usually limited to collections of pictures, transparencies, pamphlets, filmstrips, and other such items devoted to special subject matter. There seemed to be some question about what relationship these materials would have with the existing library facilities, collections of materials already compiled by individual teachers and departments, and the audio-visual equipment at the school; and the centers were not much beyond the initial planning stages at the time of our interviews. Hence it was concluded that our efforts at assessing the impact of the Center in these terms were somewhat premature and should best be left until as late in the school year as possible.

Accordingly, during the first week of May, 1968, questionnaires and accompanying letters were sent to principals of all schools in the District and to a sample of teachers who had participated in the Workshops on Educational Technology at Catholic University during the summer of 1967. (See Appendix 3 for copies of the questionnaires and covering letters.) Separate forms were used for principals who had participated in the summer activities so that we could distinguish this group from the non-participating principals. Returns were received from 70 per cent or 50 of the participating and 63 per cent or 74 of the non-participating principals and from 51 per cent or 66 of a random sample of teachers. The following remarks are based on these returns as reported in the accompanying table of percentage distributions.

Majorities of both the participating principals and the participating teachers indicated that they found their participation in the summer workshops was of value to them in their work during the school year. However, these retrospective evaluations were somewhat more favorable among the principals than among the teachers, with none of the former and 18 per cent of the latter indicating the experience was not valuable for their subsequent work. Explanations by the individual principals and teachers as to how their participation had been of value to them were usually limited to statements about their awareness of the aims of the Center or of the role of technology in education. A few also said that they had been made more aware of the

Percentages of Public School Principal and Teacher Responses on Questionnaire Items Relating to the Educational Resources Center Program

Items		Participating Principals(1)	Non-Participating Principals(2)	Participating Teachers(3)
Rate value of Summer Workshop	Very valuable	40		21
	Somewhat valuable	60		61
	Not valuable	--		18
Had contact with Center during the school year		60	75	26
Expect to have further contact during coming year		84	88	50
Received materials or publications from the ERC		40	54	33
Heard about idea of a center in every school		100	94	67
Have a center in own school		36	37	27
Have used their own school's center		--	--	27
Anyone else at school had continuing contact with ERC		30	30	--
Have impression of present purpose of ERC		78	78	76
Personally need most for own school (class)				
New and innovative curriculum materials		24	18	36
Equipment and training in use of educational technology		30	18	29
Materials and training in individualized instruction		26	26	29
Additional training in the use of standard curriculum materials		20	38	6
Have suggestions for improvement of ERC during the coming year		54	50	60

(1) N = 50
(2) N = 74
(3) N = 66

Note: There were five respondents from non-public schools who participated in the workshops. Their replies were in no way atypical.

"changing philosophy" of the District schools and of the increasing role of "individualized instruction."

Curiously, contact with the Center during the school year was highest among the non-participant principals (75 per cent), next highest among the participating principals (60 per cent), and lowest among the participating teachers (26 per cent). However, the nature of these contacts provides a partial explanation. The non-participating principals usually reported having attended a meeting at the Center, while the other principals refered to follow-up activities and programs on many occasions. The teachers seldom maintained contact as individuals except to request materials and to make an occasional visit to the Center. However, expectation of contact with the Center during the coming school year was very prevalent among both the principal groups (over 80 per cent) and was indicated by half of the teachers (50 per cent). Summer activities are most often cited by teachers as an explanation. Also, the new building appears to be visited and used more than the original one.

Awareness of the fact that ERC has been mailing materials and announcements to the schools is quite low. Invitations to visit, to participate in summer programs, brochures, outlines of course offerings are most frequently mentioned. (The first Newsletter came after this survey.) This is in sharp contract with the high awareness of the idea of having a center in every school which undoubtedly came from the central office and involved the individual directly. However, this does suggest that there may be real advantages in a more direct linkage between the ERC and the top administrative hierarchy since principals and teachers would most likely pay more attention to messages sent from such a source.

Virtually all the principals and two-thirds of the teachers had heard of the idea of having a center in every school. However, only about a third of the principals in each group and a fourth of the teachers reported a center in their own schools. These figures are not surprising since the concept of a center was not well developed. Space in which to locate one in a school was seldom available, and materials and personnel for centers were limited. On the basis of what the directors saw in their visits to schools, the claims to have a center probably include many that were only in the earliest stages of development. The fact that the ERC made a budget request for six regional centers for demonstration purposes, suggests a recognition of the need for development assistance on this aspect of program. All teachers who reported a center in their school claimed to have made use of it themselves.

Slightly less than one-third of the principals had knowledge that anyone else in their school had been having continuing contact with the ERC.

Approximately three out of four principals and teachers claimed to have an impression of the present purpose or function of ERC. The explanations usually contained a reference to the technological aspects of education, but they suggeted a variety of roles that the Center might play. Chief among these were the primary roles of training and disseminating of information on new innovations and programs. However, it is clear from the language of the respondents that they believed the Center's potential in these areas could best be realized by offering flexible services to teachers and to schools rather than formal programs. Terms such as "making available, helping, aiding, assistance, providing opportunity, acquainting, cooperating, etc.," were much in evidence while "training, teaching, directing and informing were seldom used. Both principals and teachers suggested that they wanted the Center to respond to their needs and requests and to treat them as practicing professionals, rather than offering packaged programs, superimposed from outside.

In an attempt to ascertain the extent to which Center program objectives were directed at felt needs in the schools, principals and teachers were asked to rank the relative contribution of four alternatives: (1) new and innovative curriculum materials; (2) equipment and training in use of educational technology; (3) material and training in individualized instruction; and (4) additional training in use of standard curriculum materials. There was not consensus among either teachers or principals as to which of the four alternatives suggested in the questionnaire would make the most contribution to their own schools or classrooms. Both participating principals and teachers were somewhat more favorably disposed toward new and innovative curriculum materials and educational technology than the non-participant principals. This might reflect the fact that the Center was more successful in recruiting for its programs among the more favorably disposed, but it might also be attributable to some attitude change brought about by Center programs. It should also be noted that principals, to a greater degree than teachers, reported there was more need for training in the use of standard curriculum materials, while the teachers expressed the need for new and innovative curriculum materials. This difference might also be partly attributable to selective recruitment in that the Center's programs may have been more successful in reaching teachers who were already skilled in standard practices and were searching for alternatives. It is noteworthy that the non-participating principals were the most conservative in this respect with 38 per cent stating that the largest contribution could be made in their schools by providing additional training in the use of standard curriculum materials. This suggests that if the Center is to undertake in-service training as a major function, it will encounter a felt need for improving or upgrading traditional practices as well as stressing the new and innovative. In addition, the generally flat distribution of percentages over the four alternatives as to perceived needs suggests that the tasks of the Center may be somewhat more complex than originally conceived.

Half the principals in each group and 60 per cent of the teachers had some suggestion to make as to how the usefulness of the ERC might be improved during the coming years. Some teachers and principals had very specific suggestions of a programatic nature such as saying that the Center should give closed circuit TV its full attention, stress individualized instruction, or train all teachers in the use of talking typewriters, but these were the exceptions. Most respondents made general suggestions that could be coded into one or another of the following four categories:

Convenience. Several complained it was difficult to use the Center because of its location, the limited hours during which it was open, and poor parking facilities. (Reference here was to the BNA Building.) They suggested extending hours to include late evenings and weekends, decentralizing the Center so that there would be several places that could be visited, and providing substitutes and release time for teachers.

Availability. It was noted by some that films and other equipment on display at the Center or used in demonstrations were not available to individual schools and teachers. Several praised the convenience and efficiency of the audio-visual services provided in the system and wanted to see a direct connection between ERC and these. Some sense of frustration at having been exposed to advanced methods and materials that were not accessible at the school level was expressed.

Communication. Several remarked that they felt they knew very little about the activities that the Center had initiated or made available. They suggested this could be remedied by the Center's issuing a bulletin at regular intervals and having a teacher-representative at every school.

Response to Needs. Some concern was expressed that the schools and their personnel were not consulted as to their individual needs and how the Center might relate to these. The feeling was that the Center was bringing in outside ideas and equipment without giving sufficient thought to how these could best be adapted to the special needs of the Washington schools. Some teachers expressed a desire that there be more "doing" and less "talking" at the Center, and some suggested that having demonstrations given by manufacturer's representatives instead of taking the trouble to train a local teacher was harmful.

Further comments and interpretations will be made in Part IV of this report. (For complete list of principal and teacher open-ended answers, see Appendix 5.)

Interviews with administrative and supervisory personnel

Almost all suprevising directors responsible for various subject areas and several central office administrators were interviewed to ascertain the nature of their contact with the Educational Resources Center. (The interview instrument appears in Appendix 4.)

Most of those interviewed had had substantial contacts with the ERC, at least in the planning stage. Many had developed specific expectations for the Center which were not being realized. Often these expectations, which usually related to their specific needs, became their criteria for evaluating much of what the Center had been doing. While initially inquiry was made about the contacts of each interviewee with the Center, all talked freely and emphatically and interviewers searched primarily for clarification. Responses of interviewees have been organized around topics which were mentioned most frequently.

Catholic University Workshops. Most of those interviewed had contact with the workshops of the spring and summer of 1967 which were operated under the auspices of Catholic University. Some administrative opinion suggested they had been well conceived and were in line with interests and needs of teachers. Supervising directors, in the main, were not as generous. Some subject representatives felt their teachers were ahead of the program, so it had little to offer. Others criticized its generality, the lack of opportunity to operate equipment, the absence of follow-up, or the absence of impact.

In-service education. On a few occasions supervising directors expressed satisfaction with ERC's providing facilities and substitute time for in-service activities. Nevertheless, many requests for workshops and/or other forms of aid were reported to have gone unanswered. Although some recognized the possibility that funds to meet these requests were not available, the lack of communication in response to requests caused ill feeling.

ERC personnel. Many complimentary remarks were made about individual Center personnel as personalities. The manner of assignment of coordinators to subject areas, however, came under attack. Many of these persons were said to have little or no experience in the specific areas to which they were assigned. Where they did know a subject area, some were said to be incapable at either the elementary or the secondary levels. In addition, it was reported that few systematic attempts had been made to work through the supervising director's offices to investigate the scope and nature of existing programs in various subject areas. In the words of one supervising director, "They get lost in a sea of generalities."

ERC building and facilities. The physical aspects of the ERC came in for many comments. Some were general and probably summarized feelings of dissatisfaction. Others were specific and their reactions seemed to result from misunderstandings, hopes which had not been realized, or varied concepts of what was needed.

The newness and superiority of the ERC building and meeting facilities in comparison to those of many of the interviewees might be enough to engender jealousy, but this was mentioned by only a few. Comments which referred to it as a museum, a look-see venture, or a show-place probably reflected hopes for its use. Several individuals had requested, at the planning stage, that special facilities be incorporated for their subject field and two read from the initial proposal and correspondence to substantiate their plans. Mention was made of a need for materials and resource centers for teachers, well stocked with varied up-to-date items relating to their specific subject field. One wanted it to be a demonstration teaching center where children could be taken, on occasion, for this purpose. The absence of professional and textbook libraries, and of innovative curriculum materials in various subject fields, as well as the absence of money and facilities to permit teachers to use the Center for the preparation of instructional plans and teaching materials was mentioned several times. The inability to even borrow materials for use bothered many. This was an instance where, in the view of several, the school system had not provided for basic needs and now this new agency did not do so either. Teaching teachers to make transparencies was of little use if there was no money for film. Demonstrating the video-taping equipment was regarded as useless when tape was not available.

There were other pronounced feelings expressed on the discrepancy between what was demonstrated and what was possible. Frequent mention was made of the Center's incorporation of expensive equipment, some of untested quality, when supervising directors and teachers could not secure much less expensive equipment already proven to be of value. Some mention was made of teachers having to buy their own simple equipment and materials. Others mentioned that the school had ceased to be their favorite charity. One said the ERC was simply a source of frustration for teachers.

The location of the Center was criticized for its lack of parking facilities. Opinions were mixed about whether or not teachers would visit the Center on their own time. The concensus was that for any real and meaningful use of the facilities, teachers would have to be provided either with released time or additional pay.

Feelings were also expressed that the ERC was spreading both their personnel and funds "too thin." (At the time of the interviews, 1968 summer plans for curriculum work at the Center were being formed.) Mention was made that in an effort to get started in a number of subject areas, the Center had offered meager sums for master teachers to write curricula during the summer. Several supervising directors felt that the ERC should work in cooperation with the supervising directors to develop a meaningful program in one area at a time, rather than making a superficial start in several fields. The importance of working through the subject-matter offices was stressed most strongly.

In the course of almost all interviews very positive statements emerged about the Media Center. The accessibility of materials and help was cited in contrast to the relative lack of help from ERC. A number of the supervising directors recommended a merger of ERC with the Media Center. Certainly there was a lack of clarity on the relationships or distinctions between these two units.

There were scattered favorable comments about the Center. Mention has been made of comments favorable to personnel and in support of in-service programs. Several commended the idea of developing resource centers in individual buildings, but these were illustrations of things needed to serve teachers and students.

Throughout the interviews, the interviewees asked general questions, e.g., What is their purpose? Do they have an organized program? What are they up to? What are they doing? In spite of these questions, strong opinions were expressed on many aspects of the ERC program. However, it was clear that while much of the program was not viewed with favor, and things not being done were still hoped for, the interviewers felt that those being interviewed believed themselves to be "on the outside" when really they wanted and felt they needed to be involved. Some felt they lacked information, some hoped that what they saw were merely the problems of getting started. Some suspected that insufficient funds were the source of many problems. One felt that the supervising directors should be brought in to revamp the ERC. The criticisms were more expressions of disappointment than of anger or antagonism.

One point was of especial interest to the evaluators. No one wanted to abolish the Center. Several wanted to remake it. All seemed to feel that there was great need for such an agency. However, the stress was on an agency to serve them and their programs, and to serve teachers. There was no mention of a pioneering agency in materials, in curriculum development, or in individualizing instruction.

The section which follows will relate Parts II and III of this report and make recommendations.

Part IV - Interpretations and Recommendations

This part of the report will relate observations made in Parts II and III, add other relevant material that may be important for clarifying the evaluators' conclusions, and for proposing possible focal points for attention in the continued development of the Center.

1. As indicated in Part II, there was careful planning for the Center and a clear indication of intended relationships, with the supervising directors carrying major responsibilities for leadership on the instructional program within the District public schools, and with independent and parochial school personnel. There were many indications that the conception of the Center was sound, that it filled a much needed role and that it was believed that its continuance was highly important. As far as could be determined, the Center served independent and parochial schools well, and contributed much to the public schools; yet it encountered some problems in relating effectively to some segments of the public school system. The problems that arose appeared to result more from a gap between expectations and achievement rather than from a dissatisfaction with the quality of performance.

2. The evaluators agree with the general consensus that the Center, or its functions are much needed in Washington, D. C. and should be continued and extended. However, a reconsideration of three aspects of the Center's program appears appropriate. These are (1) in-service education, (2) curriculum development, and (3) utilization of technology.

In-service education. The task of in-service education and staff development in the District public, independent and parochial schools is much greater than the potential of the Center's present resources. The whole task of staff orientation and induction, of meeting the needs for in-service education relative to curriculum innovations in general, as well as in the various subject fields dwarfs the present effort. Much greater resources must be brought to bear upon this area if success is to be achieved.

Results on the staff questionnaire used in the Passow study, and not previously reported, reveal that although substantial percentages of the teachers indicate having participated in in-service activities, their judgment as to the helpfulness of these activities was only fair. Further, in spite of this judgment approximately one-fourth of the teachers in elementary, junior and senior high schools indicated that they would like to spend more time on in-service training. (See tables in Appendix 6.)

Curriculum development. The tasks of designing curricula and instructional strategies, as well as of modifying and adapting such plans and proposals originating outside the system are now very inadequately handled. The financial resources, and the types of specialized professional skills needed to erect a defensible total modern educational program are not available. To center curriculum development in a few teachers coopted for summer work seems quite inadequate. Certainly care in providing for effective teacher participation at crucial points is important but teachers require many kinds of specialized assistance for this work which they do not now have.

Technology and its utilization. The introduction of modern technology is a more complicated task than it may appear to be. The Center staff has remarkable insights, skills and enthusiasm in this area; however, unless a systems approach can be used in which availability of materials and equipment supports demonstration and in-service education, waste is certain to result. Further, the various subject-specialists as well as all major instructional influences must be mobilized, insofar as possible, for a coordinated effort if success is to be achieved.

A systematic tally of the use of audio-visual equipment and materials available through the Educational Media Center during selected periods of 1967 and 1968 was planned as one aspect of the evaluation. This appeared to be less significant than had originally been expected because of the nature of the Center's program development. Nevertheless, the figures show that the audio-visual operation in the schools has been increasing steadily, but this is largely attributable to Title I and II (ESEA) monies and probably has little to do with the more recent appearance of the ERC.(16) It is quite likely that the Educational Media Center's operation, at least in respect to catalog, should be integrated at the school level with the school resources centers. This would facilitate teachers' being able to discover more easily what is available in their own building, as well as what is available on loan from the Media Center. In addition, the need for clarification of the functions of the two Centers in staff members' minds and the importance of a mutually reinforcing effort seems clear.

Certainly unlimited resources are not available to pour into the three aspects of program mentioned above: (1) in-service education;

---

(16) The Educational Media Center has excellent annual summaries of requests received and honored by building units and special departments, as well as summaries of financial allotments and of the content of the Center by years.

(2) curriculum development; and (3) technology and its utilization. Indeed, if unlimited resources were available, success would still not be assured. A master plan and a coordinated strategy is necessary if the resources now available are to have their potential impact on improved instruction in the Washinton, D. C. schools.

3. The Center has suffered from a lack of clarity of function. Probably this has been due in part to the character of the system-wide organization relating to instruction and to the unsettled conditions in the school system. However, the goal displacement described was probably furthered by the limitations placed on personnel and the nature of their assignments. This uncertainty about function had a telling effect at many points, but especially in respect to the distinctions drawn between the Center's operating as a service or as an innovating agency.

Original plans for the Center appear to imply a strong service intent. Yet many problems of implementation already cited limited its potential for functioning effectively in this service capacity.

Without high-level administrative line leadership, the Center was unable to work out its problems, especially as they related to the supervising directors. To a considerable extent the Center sought to build a program of its own, focussed largely in the realm of innovative materials and curricula. Yet, it has found it difficult to gain either the acceptance or the resources for these tasks. It has sought to operate through building its own staff and program, and placing its representatives in the schools. This has not succeeded either.

Further, the precise nature of the innovation task has not been clearly analyzed. The distinctions among such matters as (1) creating new innovations, (2) adapting or modifying for use the creations of others, and (3) disseminating innovations have not been clearly defined. The Center is in too weak position in the administrative hierarchy to be very effective in any aspect of the innovation tasks mentioned above. As minimums, strong support from a line officer in instruction, personnel appropriate to the task, and some freedom to attend to these tasks in the midst of the day-to-day rush of the ongoing program appear to be essentials. Unless such conditions are arranged, the necessary time for a creative approach to problems, the institution of needed in-house records and bookkeeping, and the attention to evaluation will be quite impossible.

It is within this service-innovation context, particularly, that the relation of the Center to various other Title III or similar projects needs study. These activities along with the various special requests and proposal preparations have been great drains on time. Energy devoted in these directions may have been stimulated in part by lack of central administrative support and inadequate clarity of function. These related activities and services appear to deserve further attention as the Center moves forward.

4. The Center has been in full operation, with its total staff complement and facilities, for only a few months. This evaluation came before a full operational shake-down was possible. The observations made and reported here are merely an effort to high-light focal points for attention as the organization seeks to improve its effectiveness. Naturally there are some "creaks and groans" as an effort of this size and complexity

seeks to chart its course in a very troubled school and community situation. Only experience and continuing evaluation will make possible a smoothly and effectively functioning unit.

Appendix 1

Excerpts from, "Application for Federal Grant to Establish, Operate and Maintain a Supplementary Educational Center and Services," pp. 2-6.

Excerpts from, "Application for Federal Grant to Establish, Operate and Maintain a Supplementary Educational Center and Services," pp. 2-6.

SECTION I: PROJECT PROPOSAL

A. The proposed Educational Resources Center will be the principal vehicle through which the District of Columbia Public Schools will provide assistance to public and non-public school teachers relative to their classroom instruction. This assistance will be in the form of in-service education, curriculum development and educational materials. These services of the Center may be described as follows:

1. In-service education and curriculum development

The Center will provide the organization as well as the facilities and materials necessary for a comprehensive in-service education program. As has been cited above, the lack of a unified approach to in-service education in the District schools has accounted for voids or duplications in the offerings of assistance to teachers. The modification of these problems by means of the Center can perhaps best be shown by the proposed organization. A formal organizational chart is shown on the following page.

The Educational Resources Center will be headed by the Director of Curriculum assisted by a Coordinator and an Assistant Coordinator. The Director of Curriculum and of the Educational Resources Center will have the over-all responsibility for the administration of the Educational Resources Center, the program of the Center and the curriculum research and development program of the public school system. The Director will supervise directly the Coordinator of the Center as well as the Supervising Directors of Educational Media, Library Sciences and the Supervising Directors of Curriculum. The Director will serve as the liaison officer representing the Center for the necessary over-all planning with the Assistant Superintendents in regard to programs mutually affecting the Center and the public school system. The Director will arrange for maximum use of the Center in implementing new curriculum-oriented proposals and will be involved in other curriculum planning proposals. He will be similarly involved in appropriate degree in regard to Titles I, II, and IV. The Director, the Coordinator, and other officers in the Center will assume public relation roles in interpreting the educational program to the public through the Center. The chief responsibilities of the Coordinator will be the coordination and development of the in-service education program, the cooperation with the Director of Curriculum on curriculum development, the management of the Center, the development of the professional curriculum laboratory and the distribution of curriculum materials.

Working under the Coordinator of the Center will be 6 in-service and program coordinators, representing all subject fields serving kindergarten through grade 12 and two special fields -- early childhood and special education. These coordinators will be responsible for the in-service education of the teachers of his particular field or fields. He will plan and develop the in-service program for his subject field in cooperation with the Supervising Director of that field.

He will work closely with the Coordinator of the Center and the other in-service education coordinators in developing courses and institutes of a general nature which would be of value for all teachers and in scheduling the in-service offerings. Since specific subject field courses of study must be up-to-date if good instruction is desired, a second responsibility of the in-service Coordinator will be to work with the Supervising Director in establishing needs for writing courses of study for his subject field and subsequently, to work with individuals designated by the Supervising Director of the subject field to write a course of study. This team of writers will work under the direction of the Supervising Directors of Curriculum of the existing Curriculum Department. The in-service and program coordinator will be responsible for the utilization of the resources of the Center and the participation of teachers in the Center programs for the special field which he represents. The services provided by the in-service and program coordinators will supplement the services now offered by present staff.

The formal offerings at the Center for improvement of instruction have been planned with the over-all consideration of the needs of over 6500 District of Columbia teachers. Seminars and workshops on topics appropriate for teachers of all levels and fields have been planned; topics include the following: human relations, communications, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Additional seminars and workshops have been planned for teachers at different school grade levels and in the various subject fields. In-service education will be included on utilization of equipment and materials in the two specific units which will be a part of the Center; namely, the educational media and the graphic arts unit.

2. Educational materials

- A professional curriculum laboratory will have professional books, periodicals, curriculum bulletins, printed resource materials, and sample textbooks used in schools. The newest in publications will be secured in an attempt to keep professionals in the District of Columbia abreast with developments in the field of education and other disciplines.

- A collection of curriculum materials will be designated for each subject area and equipment will be provided in specific areas where it is needed for in-service education and where existing equipment cannot be used.

- The Educational Resources Center will also contain a collection of District-approved instructional materials and an exhibit of sample materials which will provide the opportunity for teachers to critically study all materials at first-hand rather than merely selecting at random or using those kinds of titles which seem to be the "style."

- The Center will house a collection of special materials for the culturally deprived. Since cultural deprivation is experienced by approximately 30% of the children enrolled in the District of Columbia Schools, teachers need instructional materials designed especially to compensate for these educational disadvantages. However, since such materials are scarce, there is need for the development of additional aids and guides. Special curriculum material development will be the responsibility of specialists at the Center.

- An extensive educational media department will be an important part of the Center. It will be supplemental to the present audio-visual department which is a well-developed unit but totally inadequate for a system the size of Washington, D. C. In the unit will be audio-visual equipments such as record players and projectors, and records, films, filmstrips, slides, transparencies, pictures and other audio and visual instructional materials. These will be loaned to the schools to supplement the equipment and materials that are located within the school.

- Another integral part of the Educational Resources Center is the Graphic Arts unit. A two-fold function will be accomplished here; one, will be the in-service education of school staff on the preparation of materials and the use of equipment for reproduction purposes, and two, the actual production of curriculum materials. Presently, within the school system, there is no adequate facility for the production of curriculum materials.

FACILITIES

To attain maximal effectiveness of the program of the Center, it will be necessary to have funding provided: for consultative services of specialists; for substitute service for teachers to participate in daytime programs; and for the payment of services to specialists or to provide released time for teachers for curriculum writing.

In order to carry out the programs of in-service education outlined above, the Educational Resources Center will be physically located in an area of the city that can be easily reached from all over the District of Columbia. The building will be air-conditioned, modern and have adequate parking facilities to accommodate large groups such as those attending in-service activities. The Center will be open for use on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m., on Saturday from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. and on Sunday from 1 a.m. to 6 p.m. Experience over a period of time will determine changes in the schedule.

In planning for a new physical facility such as an instructional media center the question always arises as to the necessity for additional quarters. A survey of several groups of individuals resulted in the following reasons being listed for the impracticality of trying to use existing regular school facilities for in-service education purposes:

- Space is limited in school buildings; school buildings are over-crowded; sub-standard rooms are now in use for classrooms.

- Disruption of regular class schedules for students if in-service programs were to be housed in school buildings; crowded conditions in schools result in maximum use of the building for students.

- Many of the school buildings are used by the District of Columbia Recreation Department after regular school hours. To secure permission to use other buildings, which may not be adequate, means a formal application well in advance.

Conversations with realtors and investigations of available buildings in the District of Columbia disclose that downtown buildings rent for $5.00 per square foot and buildings on the fringe of the central location for $4.50 per square foot. Since a location easily reached by teachers in all areas of the District of Columbia is necessary, a facility is being sought on the fringe of the center of the city. Commitments cannot be made directly by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia; all rentals of facilities by District Government agencies must be handled through the Department of Buildings and Grounds of the District of Columbia Government.

The facility needed for the Resources Center is one of approximately 25,000 square feet. Alterations will be made to provide for a conference room to accommodate 150 persons. For multiple purposes this room will have sliding doors to divide it into 4 small conference rooms. A lecture room with a seating capacity of approximately 100 which will have a sliding door to divide it into 2 smaller rooms will be included. These rooms will be used for meetings and for reviewing audio-visual materials. An area of about 4500 square feet will be provided for the curriculum laboratory. Separate areas will be provided for the Graphic Arts and Distribution

Centers. Special installations will be made for the communications laboratory, the reading center, and the science-industrial arts center. Offices for the staff of the Center and for the Curriculum Department will be a part of the facility.

RESULTS

What will, hopefully, be accomplished with an Educational Resources Center? It is anticipated that some of the outcomes will be:

- Improved instruction as the result of a coordinated in-service education program.
- Improved instruction as the result of the utilization by teachers of professional materials housed in the Center.
- Improved instruction as the result of the opportunity of teachers to listen to and work with specialists in education and other fields.
- Improved instruction as a result of increased articulation, a product of a cooperative and inter-disciplinary approach made easily possible through the unified approach of the program of the Center.
- Improved instruction through use of curriculum courses and guides developed through the organization of the Center.
- Improved instruction resulting from improved teacher morale as an outcome of released time for in-service education.

Appendix 2

EXCERPTS FROM CONTRACT NO. 6871 BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND GORDON N. MACKENZIE, MARVIN SONTAG AND DAVID WILDER COVERING THE PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 1967 TO AUGUST 31, 1968

EXCERPTS FROM CONTRACT NO. 6871 BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND GORDON N. MACKENZIE, MARVIN SONTAG AND DAVID WILDER COVERING THE PERIOD OF APRIL 1, 1967 TO AUGUST 31, 1968

The contractor, Gordon N. Mackenzie, Marvin Sontag and David E. Wilder of Teachers College, Columbia University, agrees to conduct an evaluation of the District of Columbia Public Schools' Educational Resources Center.

The contractor will use the following procedures in conducting the evaluation:

1. The contractor will gather base-line data on educational technology in four areas:
    a. The audio-visual equipment and materials available in each public and private school building.
    b. The audio-visual equipment and materials available from out-of-building sources, and the terms under which they can be obtained.
    c. The use which teachers are making of audio-visual equipment and materials.
    d. The programs and facilities in individual buildings for fostering audio-visual equipment and materials use.
2. Selected data from the teacher questionnaire of the Teachers College, Columbia University Study of the Washington Schools will be used as supplementary base-line information.
3. Data relating to numbers 1 and 2 above will be collected from principals, supervisors, special subject teachers and any other appropriate individuals working with teachers or carrying special teaching assignments.
4. Contact will be made with the Center of Educational Technology at Catholic University to gather information relative to the purpose and rationale for their activities planned for this spring. These include:
    a. Curriculum and A. V. Inter-face
    b. Tri-Conference on Educational Technology
    c. Workshop in Educational Technology
        1. For classroom teachers
        2. For special subject teachers and their supervising directors.

5. Observations will be made of all of these activities and careful records kept of the organization and proceedings. Special attention will be directed to the workshops.

6. Data such as that outlined in 1 and 2 above, and any other data gathered before the spring conferences, will be sought in the fall of 1967 as it relates to participants in the spring meetings, to assess any changes which might have occurred.

7. Consequences of "Curriculum and A. V. Inter-Face" will be sought after its products have been introduced and used for a considerable period.

8. Workshops set up next fall as a continuation of the spring of 1967 workshops will be studied in a manner similar to that proposed above, but with such modifications as experience may dictate. Consideration could be given to classroom observation as a source of data on consequences.

9. Coordinators will conduct in-service education activities in the use of audiovisual materials. During the coming school year a program of evaluation similar to that outlined above will be conducted with coordinators, starting with the planning of their activities.

   Assistance will be rendered to the coordinators in planning their activities in relation to evaluation efforts, and in gathering their own evaluation data.

10. Data will be gathered from a sample of schools in the spring of 1968 to assess any changes which have occurred relative to items 1 and 2 above. Other categories of data will be gathered at this time as the new activities, started during the coming year, may suggest.

11. Informal evaluations of many kinds will be gathered as these relate to the process of change, personnel involved, organization climate, and other matters. It is recognized that as the project develops and as changes of directions may occur evaluation procedures will of necessity be modified or adapted.

Appendix 3

Questionnaires to Principals and Teachers

Columbia University in the City of New York | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

605 WEST 115th STREET

May 6, 1968

Dear Teacher,

We are conducting a followup study of the activities of the Educational Resources Center during the past year for the Washington, D.C. schools. Your name was given to us as a participant in one of the workshops or Institutes in Educational Technology conducted during the summer of 1967 at Catholic University under the sponsorship of the Educational Resources Center.

The purpose of this inquiry is to obtain an indication from you of what, if any, lasting impact or cutgrowth has resulted from your participation in the activities of last summer; whether you have had any further contact with the Educational Resources Center personnel or activities during the current academic year; and your assessment of the appropriate role for the Center in the Washington, D.C. public school system.

Please complete the enclosed brief questionnaire and return it in the stamped envelope provided so that your responses can be taken into account in our report and in recommendations to the school system.

Sincerely,

David E. Wilder, Ph.D.
Research Associate

DEW:sl
enclosure

Questionnaire for Teachers

Name of school where you are located____________________

1. Looking back at your participation in the institute or workshop last summer, how would you rate the value of that experience for your work as a teacher this past school year?

_____ very valuable
_____ somewhat valuable
_____ not valuable

IF VALUABLE: please indicate briefly how it has been of value to you in your work.

2. Have you had any further contact with Center personnel since last summer?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

3. Do you expect to have any further contact with Center personnel during the coming year?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly

4. Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly

5. Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school?

_____yes _____no

Is there a center in your school?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: have you had occasion to make use of it?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

6. Do you have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

7. From the standpoint of your needs as a classroom teacher in the school where you teach, what do you estimate would be the relative value to you of each of the following? (rank from 1 to 4)

_____New and innovative curriculum materials
_____Additional equipment and training in the use of educational technology
_____Materials and training in individualized instruction
_____Additional training in the use of standard curriculum materials

8. Please use the remaining space (and the reverse side, if necessary) to indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the Educational Resources Center to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

Columbia University in the City of New York | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

605 WEST 115th STREET

May 6, 1968

Dear Principal,

We are conducting a followup study of the activities of the Educational Resources Center during the past year for the Washington D.C. schools. Your name was given to us as a participant in one of the workshops or Institutes in Educational Technology conducted during the summer of 1967 at Catholic University under the sponsorship of the Educational Resources Center.

The purpose of this inquiry is to obtain an indication from you of what, if any, lasting impact or outgrowth has resulted from your participation in the activities of last summer; whether you have had any further contact with the Educational Resources Center personnel or activities during the current academic year; and your assessment of the appropriate role for the Center in the Washington D.C. public school system.

Please complete the enclosed brief questionnaire and return it in the stamped envelope provided so that your responses can be taken into account in our report and in recommendations to the school system.

Sincerely,

DEW:sl
enclosure

David E. Wilder, Ph.D.
Research Associate

Questionnaire for Workshop Participants

1. Looking back at your participation in the institute or workshop last summer, how would you rate the value of that experience now for your work as a principal?

_____very valuable
_____somewhat valuable
_____not valuable

IF VALUABLE: please indicate briefly how it has been of value to you in your work.

2. Have you had any further contact with Center personnel since last summer?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

3. Do you expect to have any further contact with Center personnel during the coming year?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

4. Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

5. Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school?

_____yes _____no

Is there a center in your school?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: what is the position of the person in charge? (English teacher, librarian, etc.?)

6. To the best of your knowledge, has anyone in your school (other than you) had continuing contact with the Educational Resources Center and its activities?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly

7. Do you now have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly

8. From the standpoint of the needs of your school, what do you estimate would be the relative contribution of each of the following during the next few years? (Rank from 1 to 4)

_____Development of new and innovative curriculum materials.
_____Training of teachers in the use of educational technology.
_____Materials and training in individualized instruction.
_____Inservice training for teachers in the use of standard (already available) curriculum materials.

9. Please use the reverse side to indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the ERC to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

Columbia University in the City of New York | *New York, N.Y. 10025*

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

605 WEST 115th STREET

May 6, 1968

Dear Principal,

We are conducting a study of the impact of the activities of the Educational Resources Center during the past year for the Washington, D.C. public schools. As part of this study, we are making a survey of the principals of all schools in the system.

The purpose of this inquiry is to ascertain what contact, if any, you have had with the Educational Resources Center during the current academic year, and your assessment of the appropriate role for the Center in the Washington, D.C. public school system.

Please complete the enclosed brief questionnaire and return it in the stamped envelope provided so that your responses can be taken into account in our report and recommendations to the school system.

Sincerely,

David E. Wilder, Ph.D.
Research Associate

Questionnaire for Principals

1. Have you personally had any contact with the personnel or activities of the Educational Resources Center during this past year?

    _____yes _____no

    IF YES: please explain briefly.

2. Do you expect to have contact with the Center personnel or participate in any of its activities during the coming year?

    _____yes _____no

    IF YES: please explain briefly.

3. Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

    _____yes _____no

    IF YES: please explain briefly.

4. Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school?

    _____yes _____no

    Is there a center in your school?

    _____yes _____no

    IF YES: what is the position of the person in charge? (English teacher, librarian, etc.)

5. To the best of your knowledge, has anyone in your school (other than you) had continuing contact with the Educational Resources Center and its activities?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

6. Do you now have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center?

_____yes _____no

IF YES: please explain briefly.

7. From the standpoint of the needs of your school, what do you estimate would be the relative contribution of each of the following during the next few years? (Rank from 1 to 4)

_____Development of new and innovative curriculum materials.
_____Training of teachers in the use of educational technology.
_____Materials and training in individualized instruction.
_____Inservice training for teachers in the use of standard (already available) curriculum materials.

8. Please use the remaining space (and the reverse side, if necessary) to indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the ERC to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

Appendix 4

CENTRAL STAFF - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

CENTRAL STAFF - INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction - stress ideas as follows:

a. Our awareness that this is early for an evaluation effort.

b. Responses are confidential.

c. We are looking for ways to help the Center as well as to evaluate current status.

1. Have you had any contact with the ERC this past year?

   a. If not, probe as follows:

      Have you visited their new facilities?

      Have any of your people attended their summer program at Catholic University?

      Have you had any visits from any Center personnel?

   b. If yes, what was the nature of this contact? Follow-up to get description as well as any positive or negative feeling associated with either the product or personnel involved.

2. Are you presently involved with the Center on any activities? Explain.

   How is this activity progressing? Probe as in one above.

3. Are you planning to contact the Center about any new activities or projects?

4. What are the major shortcomings of the Center as you see it?

5. What are the major strengths?

6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Center?

7. Get specific reaction to summer program.

8. Did your people encounter resource centers in the schools?

Appendix 5

Open-Ended Answers
Teacher and Principal Questionnaires

TEACHERS' OPEN-ENDED ANSWERS

Question #1 - Looking back at your participation in the institute or workshop last summer, how would you rate the value of that experience for your work as a teacher this past school year?

I became acquainted with some valuable techniques. The value of all - familiar and new - was so well presented and stressed one had to become enthusiastic.

I am aware of it and I am more knowledgeable about it in my service on the budget committee.

Gained knowledge of how to use opaque projector - sources of resource materials and individualized materials.

The workshop gave an opportunity to me to become familiar with innovations taking place in a number of areas. I was able to come back and use some of the ideas in individualizing instruction in my classroom even though I did not have the specific materials and equipment. I was able to correlate what I saw with later workshops in Team Teaching and Individualized Instruction.

Introduction to and demonstration of systems approach to educational problems; learned about new materials and equipment which I have used for the first time this year.

It made me aware of many different kinds of educational media.

The use of various pieces of hardware (I have had the opportunity to use) was made clear to me.

I learned how to use some new machines.

At the "theoretical" level.

I have used several of the educational media and techniques seen at the institute.

Theoretically -- very valuable. Practically -- the equipment necessary was not available,thus I couldn't use all the information.

Ideas arising from group session following mass meeting produce many new ideas for discipline.

Only to the extent that I was able to use the overhead projector more effectively. We have none of the other machines and equipment available at our building.

Teachers - Question #1 (continued)

I was a leader of small-group discussions (an hour's demonstration of group dynamics principles) and the reinforcement of this small effort came when District teachers said they wanted my help in their classrooms.

I have made more use of the filmstrip projector, the movie projector and overhead projector. Made more transparencies.

Use of overhead projector, making transparencies, being introduced to other types of machines and other innovations in education.

I used more audio-visual aids. I also used the equipment in different ways.

Teachers

Question #2 - Have you had any further contact with Center personnel since last summer?

Invitation to visit and to participate in the use of the materials. Several of the personnel showed me how to use the new materials.

Received a brochure on content of information at Center.

Budget Committee hearings for supplies and equipment.

Mr. Otello Meucci visited our class in Elementary School Principalship, 3/18/68, talked about the Center and its objectives, showed film "Make a Mighty Reach."

In-service training workshop for use of electric typewriter to teach reading (Greeley Booth); mid-year evaluation of program.

Personally involved in use of innovative materials in the teaching of reading at Ketcham Annex. V. Young was a member of the team of instructors in DCTC course at Hine Junior High School first semester.

As I am now an assistant principal some of the questions are not applicable. However, I did go on a tour of the Center recently.

The film, "Make a Mighty Reach" was secured and shown to our faculty. I made a visit to the Center to browse and further familiarize myself with some of the "hardware."

I requested and used the film shown during the workshop. The film was "Make a Mighty Reach." I visited the Center once.

I am working in Educational Technology at Catholic University for one of my supporting exams in Adult Education Doctoral program.

They were a part of one class meeting in a course which I took in Individualizing Education this year.

Teachers

Question #3 - Do you expect to have any further contact with Center personnel during the coming year?

I plan to use the Center this summer to plan my work since we are individualizing instruction, and we are involved in a Special Learning Project.

We are planning to reorganize the curriculum and plan to include as many types of educational media as possible. We will need help in deciding which will be most beneficial.

Formulation of materials for large group counseling.

Our class will meet at the ERC on May 20.

Evaluation of teaching program with electric typewriter. I wish to use Center personnel and services to learn to make and use transparencies for the overhead projector for use in a reading improvement program.

As classroom needs arise and the Center is accessible to me either in this school or downtown.

Follow-up for reading project; hope to work on curriculum revision.

I hope to be notified when the Center will be open to teachers.

My contact will be greater this year since I have requested a Resource Center for my school.

I expect to work with the Urban Teachers Corps in the fall of 1968. I feel that this will be quite valuable to the interns and me.

Visits to the Center to familiarize myself with materials available; to gather ideas about making learning more meaningful to children and to make suggestions to administrators.

If we have a team teaching program.

If necessary equipment is made available.

Plan to attend a one-day summer workshop as a follow-up during the month of August.

Continued work as a student and part-time staff member. This August I will be teaching programmed instruction as part of Dr. Ofiesh's team.

If intermediate grades begin a team teaching program in the next year.

I intend to go down to the Center more often.

Except to visit the Center and also make use of available materials.

Teachers - Question #3 (continued)

We are planning an in-service demonstration in the fall.

I am planning to use the services offered by the Center as needed.

I will attend an institute during the summer of 1969.

Teachers

Question #4 - Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

Received a brochure on content of information at Center.

We've received technical equipment from the government: tape-film strips.

Notification of location and hours of ERC for D.C.

I have received a manual explaining the procedures and methods in the Greeley Booth.

The materials and publications distributed at the institute last summer were used as resource material to describe educational technology, programmed instruction, and various machines to a staff meeting of 100 reading teachers.

One brochure.

General memos and notices sent to all members of teaching staff.

I asked a question at the Workshop and the answer was forwarded to me.

I have expected to hear from the Center as it was promised in the institute. I would like to receive both materials and publications and participate in future workshops and institutes. I am interested in developing an effective mathematics laboratory.

Notifications of new quarters for the ERC and an invitation to visit.

Film - "Make a Mighty Reach."

Answered "yes" with reservations - material received was information listing some of the services available and the hours the Center is open.

News letters, etc. But no mailed materials as a participant.

News letter telling location and time the Center will be open and materials that will be in the Center.

A general announcement of its services and new location.

Insight into and how to best use materials available. Hoping that we shall get more resource materials near or in our school.

Teachers

Question #5 - Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school?

This ERC has not got much material which is needed on my level. It only has the regular materials I have always used. None of the hardware is available.

There is something. But it's not very educational and not very "resourceful."

Our technical equipment and audio-visual aids are in our library where all teachers have access to them.

Our material is not extensive but we have pooled all of our audio-visual material and have it in a room adjacent to the library so that all might have quick and easy access to it.

We have just begun (since April) to make use of it. It is still in the beginning stages. We have just obtained a librarian.

Since we have a small school we will not have a large center.

I myself have an excellent amount of illustrative material in my subject - ancient and medieval history - and it is available to any of the other teachers in the building who care to use it. Also, our librarian has a good supply of diversified material.

I make tapes and ditto pictures for worksheets on the Thermofax daily. I learned much of the philosophy, etc. at the workshop last summer.

The Language Arts department has many of the media, which I have been allowed to borrow, along with the materials belonging to the school.

Use of Language Master.

Teachers

Question #6 - Do you have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center?

To introduce and make available new curriculum materials.

The present purposes are to serve teachers in supplying educational resource materials and to train teachers to use materials, make their own, and to use educational "hardware."

Have you know what is available in teaching materials.

It's a place to view new "hardware."

To sell audio-visual equipment.

It is a definite help in individualizing instruction.

I think I do. It seems to me to be an adjunct to the school but also an incentive to the individual teacher to vitalize her teaching with something new - something not too difficult to obtain and of good quality.

Plentiful, accessible, up-to-date educational computer center.

Aid teachers in formulating materials for their classes.

The Center offers teachers a place for In-service training where we can find the latest things going on in education in our country.

Purpose is to propose and acquaint educators with the availability, use and functions of new teaching media.

We were advised (4/68) that we could come between the hours of 8:30 and 4:30 Monday thru Friday to get familiar with materials etc. at the Center. I think we will be able to learn how to work with the equipment.

The ERC is to be a place where teachers may go to become acquainted both with new techniques and new materials available in their fields. Equipment may be borrowed. Instruction will be given in their use. Consultants will be available.

The Center would provide materials for a teacher when teaching a particular subject or range of levels.

To display media and explain use. Possible adaptation to my particular situation.

Training with audio-visual aids; new ideas and techniques, professional library.

They seem to be off to a good start, but are in dire need of more funds to make the Center work.

Teachers Question #6 - (continued)

I would consider this a tremendous and advantageous undertaking which I hope will materialize. The Center should keep teachers informed.

I feel and hope your purpose is to provide the classroom teacher with new and innovative curriculum material and planning which will provide more effective individualization allowing each child to be successful in his learning at his own rate.

The idea of the Center is excellent in that it may be used to acquaint those interested in education with the great strides which have been made in educational technology and how this may be applied to educating today's child.

To have materials for teachers.

It makes available to teachers the opportunity to make some visual aids. It displays kinds of equipment which can be used in the classroom.

1. To acquaint the school personnel with the new trends in education.
2. To show by using trained technicians the use of educational equipment and to put in the hands of the teachers new and innovative curriculum materials.

The District ERC, on 25th and M, is fabulous. I was there last night. This questionnaire is directed to me with the idea that I am a District teacher, but I am just a visitor to the District.

To have materials available for the teachers.

I feel that the purpose of the ERC is to aid the classroom teaching in promoting more individualizing instruction thru the use of certain materials and equipment.

I feel that this Center will be of great value to the teacher. I think it will be rather difficult to make full use of the Center because of the hours that it is open,however, if the teacher can go during school hours, this would be fine.

There is resource material and information but location and time make the use of the Center impractical.

The Center appears to be most meaningful and effective as an aid to the improvement of learning in the classroom.

To familiarize teachers with materials available on the market, so that they request that their principals purchase what they need for their building.

Teachers

Question #8 - Please use the remaining space (and the reverse side, if necessary) to indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the Educational Resources Center to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

1. The time element is one that I feel could be improved. It is so hard to get substitutes if you want to take time off to make use of the Center.
2. If you are working in the far section of the city you are not able to get to the ERC and do any work before closing time. The Center closing time is too early. Teachers cannot get out of school before 3:30 PM . Closing time for the Center is 4:30.

One intern in a special training program, here, felt that the Center was too removed in approach. (Look, see, but don't touch.)

I'm a foreign language teacher completely baffled by supply ordering procedure. Suggestion: Invite manufacturers and publishers to buy and equip mobile, trailer-mounted display units. Teachers could walk out of the school's front door and order maps, globes etc. from shelf.

There should be a listing of materials and types of materials available, ways in which they may be obtained and rules governing their use. Perhaps, the public schools have these things but we do not.

Pilot centers need to be established immediately in various schools within the city, especially those new buildings that have ample space amd facilities. My school could use it very well in the 1968-69 year.

I think an institute or workshop involving all the teachers of the District would be beneficial. (One similar to the one we attended last summer, lasting over a longer period of time.)

1. Schedules for instruction in use of media for teachers.
2. Rental plans for media that is hard to obtain in small or underpriviledged schools.
3. Current and regular mailing lists of information and free materials.

The hours mentioned above make it almost impossible for a teacher to attend and get full advantage of the Center. Perhaps Saturday hours or even Sunday would be better. Or, better some released time for this purpose during the week. There is no mention of summer hours. I would favor this. Since I have not visited the Center, I could not comment on it.

I also question the location of the Center. Teachers one half to an hour or more away could not make the 4:30 closing even if they left immediately at 3:00. It is not worth the trip. It should be more centrally located. Only teachers in the immediate area could make those hours.

Teachers Question #8 (continued)

Have not seen it. It is not available except during school hours.

Money is the answer.

If there is a center in my school I do not know about it. I have not had the opportunity to use much of what I learned last summer as we don't have the equipment.

Better communication between Center and teachers.

To have a contact person in each school who would have release time to familiarize themselves with the Center and then bring back to their respective schools information about the Center.

A monthly newsletter could be sent to every school. This could contain experiences which teachers have had in using materials and ideas which have been suggested by the Center. Included also could be suggestions on the part of the personnel at the Center of how materials could be used in certain subject matter areas.

At the invitaion of the administrator, personnel from the Center could visit schools and bring along when feasible,materials which can be shown to faculty.

1. Have someone from the Center visit each school. (and vice versa)
2. I suggest there be more coordination between Center and people who order equipment so that theory can be put into practice.

A Center from which the teachers might become acquainted with new equipment and educational technology would be invaluable. More space is needed for innovations for individualizing reading, mathematics, science, social studies and language arts.

1. Hours made more convenient to the teacher (from 3:30 - allowing for travelling time - to 4:30 in the evenings is not enough time. Suggest hours from six to nine PM in addition to regular 9 to 4:30.)
2. Set up a system such as is used in the public libraries of loaning out equipment and materials on a 3 day or weekly basis; also teacher should be able to reserve certain needed publications or materials.

The ERC should be a required place to visit for every District teacher. Time during the school day should be arranged for faculties, as a group to attend, see a film and hear an explanation, and browse thru the materials.

A teacher has to SEE the stuff to be aware of what is happening. Teachers who are using teaching machines and writing behavioral objectives are communicating with other like-minded teachers -- bases for team teaching in the healthiest sense are organically developing.

Teachers Question #8 (continued)

There should be more direct contact between the teachers of the Washington schools and the ERC.

Make sure that the teacher can innovate in the classroom without being pulled back by supervisors and/or principals.

1. The ERC people should travel from time to time to make them more easily available to different school locations.
2. Resource people should contact faculties to set up lines of communication.
3. Resource Center people should find out what is wanted and needed.
4. There should be a teacher contact in each building. These teachers should be given time to visit the Center at intervals.

Close contact should be maintained between Center and every school.

PARTICIPANT PRINCIPALS' OPEN-ENDED ANSWERS

Question #1 - How has the workshop or institute been of value to you in your work?

It made me aware of materials being developed for schools. I wanted more time to actually learn to operate the equipment and to be able to show others how to operate it.

It has been of value in that it has helped me to explain some of the functions of the ERC to our faculty and to our pupils' parents.

I have been aware of and conversant with nearly every new educational resource material that has been brought to my attention.

It has made me more conscious of the advantages of using various aids. We have used aids more extensively in classrooms and faculty meetings.

I am more informed and have more ideas for the use of the equipment now on hand.

Opened some doors. Received ideas as to what might be done in the future.

Purchased some programmed materials for class.

Enabled me to understand terminology of experiments and/or innovations being initiated in various phases of our school.

It has been of value in scheduling and in group planning; also, in daily and long-range planning in goals and objectives. They are now more realistic.

The workshop was valuable in that it presented materials and information in the use of technology in the field of education. Many of the things reviewed could be applied to individualization of instruction.

In my outlook concerning the future trends in education and the necessity of individualizing instruction.

The philosophy of the D. C. schools has complete changed and this prepared me for the new innovations. Individualized instruction and team teaching are being implemented and the institute was most valuable in preparing me to help teachers.

Made me cognizant of new materials and equipment used in individualizing instruction.

Some knowledge of new machines and some new techniques. Awareness of a new approach to teaching.

It helped me to better understand the literature and discussions of educational technology and help teachers as a result.

Participant Principals - Question #1 (continued)

I am familiar with the field.

Extended my willingness to accept innovative media and ideas.

A beginning knowledge - Vocabulary awareness - Desire for more learning.

It helped to foster an awareness of the fact that "the era of the human-to-human instruction," though in full bloom, is about to fade into "one of man-machine interaction."

Provided direction and suggestions for developing a resource center within the local unit. Permitted the start of a program to utilize talents, materials and scheduling aimed at more effective learning and teaching.

It was a good orientation course, alerting one to the trends of today in education.

Participant Principals

Question #2 - Have you had any further contact with Center personnel since last summer?

At meetings for principals and at a course in individualizing instruction given by D. C. Teachers College during the fall of 1967.

We have had a speaker from the Center talk to the faculty about the resources there.

A conference on the study of Negro Life and History.

I have attended an introductory tour of the new Center and I have requested information concerning certain media from the Center. We have requested assistance with our own center in the library.

Elementary officers met at the Center for a meeting.

One workshop at the Center (introductory). Called upon the personnel on several matters.

We had two of the workshop staff members address our faculty.

During this school year I have had contact with our ERC personnel who took part in the workshop. I have used their video-tape unit for micro-teaching.

Visited the Center.

Principals' group explored the Center and listened to a speaker.

Planned visit for administration for an afternoon workshop at the ERC.

Visited the Center. Personnel spoke and guided tour of available resources.

In a meeting at their new Center.

Attended the Center on April 25, 1968 by invitation.

Received literature and attended an orientation meeting for school officers.

I visited the Center to see their displays and to hear talks about the services available.

Visited the Resources Center to see the facilities.

I have visited the Center, and have had 6 members of our school faculty participate in workshops conducted there.

1) telephone
2) meeting

Teachers enrolled in a course, "Individualizing Instruction," for which I served as an instructional team leader, were taken to the Center for demonstrations on the use of closed circuit TV. Center personnel made arrangements.

Attended a workshop in English at the Center.

Participant Principals

Question #3 - Do you expect to have any further contact with Center personnel during the coming year?

At future meetings.

At the next faculty meeting we plan to have another speaker and a demonstration.

1) I expect to familiarize myself with its resources.
2) I plan to have someone address the faculty as to its offerings.
3) I will arrange for teacher visits.

A lecture on African Culture.

I hope they will help in the setting-up of our center.

I hope to be placed on other mailing lists. I want a representative from the Center to explain to our faculty the purpose and uses of the Center.

Will visit the Center.

Hopefully.

I have requested a date for the faculty to visit.

Will visit on several occasions to learn camera techniques and to make slides and transparencies.

Undecided.

I will have further contact with the Center personnel in carrying out the objectives of a course entitled, "Individualization of Instruction" which is a staff development project (Model School).

Will use as resource for materials and services.

I'd like to arrange visits by my teachers and parents.

Full-day workshop scheduled in June at Catholic University for last year's participants.

Invited to workshops under the direction of Center personnel. Have personnel visit school to suggest specific ways Center may serve our particular needs.

Probably in workshops, faculty meetings, to help with new proposals.

Two teachers will attend Summer Workshop.

Will attend a one-day follow-up workshop this summer. Will strive to make faculty better acquainted with the Center next year.

Participant Principals - Question #3 (continued)

I am to return this summer for a follow-up.

A group of teachers is now awaiting a date for an appointment with ________.

Summer one-day meeting.

One day follow-up session on June 21, 1968.

To observe use of hardware material being used to aid individualized instructional programs.

Principal Participants

Question #4 - Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

During the time I attended the workshop.

Individualized instruction material.

An invitation to use the resources which are listed on a sheet in concise form.

I received a mimeographed booklet summarizing the workshop.

Materials have been received relative to the use of behavioral objectives and technology availability.

Outline of course. Bulletins.

Notices of materials available. Invitations to visit Center. The Center has been in the process of moving so this has curtailed many programs.

Materials giving purpose and ways Center will service schools.

Literature explaining the services has come to me.

An explanation of what the Center offers and plans to do.

A descriptive brochure detailing purposes of the Center has been distributed to each teacher.

1) Information relative to individualizing instruction.
2) Lessons in English and Physical Education have been video-taped in the building. Personnel and equipment from the Center were made available for these sessions.

Principal Participants

Question #5 - Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school? If yes, what is the position of the person in charge?

Librarian.

Librarian.

Librarian.

Our librarian is in charge of our educational resources center.

Librarian. We are only now beginning to get set up. Building program.

Librarian.

Librarian.

Two resource teachers assigned to the center.

Librarian. This is a very liberal interpretation of the term.

Librarian.

Question #6 - To the best of your knowledge, has anyone in your school (other than you) had continuing contact with the Educational Resources Center and its activities?

Our Language Arts teacher.

Librarian - for information.

I don't know.

Three of my teachers participated in the workshop session after I had participated.

Three teachers and the Librarian visited. The teachers were taking a course that required visitation.

Mrs. M. G. Labat, Principal and Mrs. M. Murray, Assistant Principal have also had contacts with the Center involving individualization of instruction, micro-teaching and technology.

English teachers.

Over 50% of the faculty have taken the course, "Individualization of Instruction." One teacher is attending Catholic University and writing her thesis in this area.

Several teachers have attended workshops at the Center, but no one has maintained continuous contact.

Another teacher and I went to visit.

Teachers visited.

Both Assistant Principals. English teachers have participated in observing demonstration lessons.

Participant Principals

Question #7 - Do you now have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center:

To acquaint teachers and other school personnel with innovations in educational technology.

Information and help.

A service center for dissemination of literature, papers, etc. to supplement the classroom work.

It is good and should be of great help to the city providing its services are made available during teachers' preparation time.

The Center still seems to be getting off the ground. Only recently did we get word that a building had been acquired.

I am not at all clear on the function of the Center.

To help teachers do a better job of teaching.

Through their flyer.

School personnel may call upon this Center for any assistance as far as their resources go.

I believe it is to offer teachers an opportunity to create and to share with others. Also, to provide extra materials.

This organization is to provide aid, help and assistance in developing teaching aids and techniques for classroom use.

Making innovative materials available and training teachers in their use.

Training center in use of media; resource for educational materials.

Presentation of innovations, new techniques. Testing ground for new ideas, machinery.

It will be open for teachers, community, etc. to use facilities.

I understand that the ERC will assist teachers in securing, making, and using needed instructional materials.

To train in the use of various machines, to help develop curriculum, to develop teaching packages.

In planning stages; of more value to elementary school than secondary.

To promote individualized instruction through educational technology.

Participant Principals - Question #7 (continued)

To help teachers improve their teaching techniques, become familiar with newest materials for instructing pupils, etc.

Most modern aids to education for teacher and pupil. Changed curriculum as needed.

To provide opportunities for in-service training relative to educational technology curriculum and materials development for individualized instruction.

To develop orientation workshops and train new personnel.

Participant Principals

Question #9 - Please indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the ERC to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

We can see great possibilities in the Center, but so far the actual usefulness of the Center has not been made clear to us.

Now that the office is situated, the present plans may be sufficient.

Please have them operative other than at 9 o'clock to 3 o'clock.

Do not promise too much. Make it practical - something that can be done soon. Did a good job last year. It would be helpful if we could see some of the equipment being used by a teacher in a classroom.

Actually, it would be helpful if the ERC would also become informed about what is happening within these schools. My specific job as Assistant Principal is to coordinate a Title III Program; however, I'm not sure that the ERC knows of the direction the program has taken.

The materials and hardware should be on loan to schools. The staff should follow the hardware for instructional purposes to faculty and students.

This, I think, must be done or can best be done after we've had at least a half year to really use the Center.

1) Increase ERC personnel so that they may create new materials for teachers to draw upon.
2) Utilize increased personnel for closer contact with building personnel and make known their offerings.
3) Diversify their areas of operations to prevent conflicts of interests while involved in assisting others.

Development of materials for individualizing instruction; training increase of same.

Paid substitutes so that teachers may get to the Center.

Train teachers to use materials and encourage them to be more innovative.

1) Providing each school with specific ways the Center has for assisting teachers.
2) Visiting schools to give real help in setting up a school center.

Make arrangements for more released time for teacher in-service training. Improve parking facilities at the Center.

More opportunity (more time) to use the Center - for learning.

Participant Principals - Question #9 (continued)

This is very difficult. I think, instead of asking teachers to develop curriculum materials, or study sheets, or teaching devices, or ways to individualize instruction, the ERC should do this and publish this material in quantity and put it in the teachers' hands. So far the dialogue is usually, "this machine works like this, if you had one." Or, "you can individualize instruction by making some drill devices, sets of practice work, etc." I feel that where possible, the ERC should relieve the teacher of this because the ERC has the time, the machines, the personnel and the atmosphere. The teacher is harassed by another department telling her what to do and doing nothing for her.

NON-PARTICIPANT PRINCIPALS' OPEN-ENDED ANSWERS

Question #1 - Have you personally had any contact with the personnel or activities of the Educational Resources Center during this past year?

FY 70 budget-planning sessions - invitations to tour facilities.

Invited to visit the Center. Met Director at a committee meeting.

The Executive Committee for the Study of the Passow Report had a meeting which I attended.

1) Clerical training of teacher aides in use of audio-visual machines and duplications.
2) Discussions re video-taping.

Attended a meeting designed to acquaint principals with the facilities available at the Center.

Our in-service "Individualized Instruction" course met there twice this spring session and we were able to work with the equipment and soft hardware.

Attended meeting at the Center.

Visited the Center on April 25th. Principals saw new machines, etc. Time was insufficient to see all machines and equipment.

I was involved with the Deputy Director on two city-wide budget committees.

Visited the Center.

All principals invited on two special days.

Tour of the Center.

I attended an open house at the ERC.

Interview with ERC coordinator, Mrs. E. Johnson.

DCEA Spring Conference (workshop). Also, in-service workshop for faculty. In-service workshop for faculty.

I attended a principals' meeting there.

Project 470.

An announcement flyer.

Principals were given a tour and working DERC was explained. Called ERC for help in operation of one of educational media.

Non-Participant Principals - Question #1 (continued)

Had an orientation tour of the Center with lecture.

Workshops and help with technical questions and problems.

Visit.

1) Visited a social studies workshop one morning in March.
2) Assistant superintendents' meeting held at Center for orientation on use of Center.

Elementary school principals were invited to visit Center last month. As part of Title III Project they video-taped story-telling group at our school.

Elementary principals met there for an orientation session.

Meeting of elementary school officers at the ERC on April 24, 1968.

One of the staff members visited the school.

Attended two meetings on uses of ERC. Held faculty meeting at Center.

Visited the Center on April 24, 1968.

Attended demonstrations.

Attended a meeting at the Center to hear a consultant and to tour the building. Attended a technology workshop sponsored by the ERC June 1967. An ERC worker served as speaker for a class I attend at DCTC. Worker with ERC personnel in a course I helped teach at DCTC

1) Attended a workshop on the Interdisciplinary Approach to Social Studies.
2) Toured the Center and had a briefing on its purposes.

1) Lectures
    a. Individual Instruction
    b. Staff Development
2) Class Discussions
3) Meeting

Tour of the Center with Deputy Director Meucci.

Non-Participant Principals

Question #2 - Do you expect to have contact with the Center personnel or participate in any of its activities during the coming year?

I understand that the Center will be involved in new plans for and coordination of staff development.

Discussions re video taping.

Would like help and advice in setting up center at Gage.

Plan to send key teachers for training and, hopefully, to have a faculty meeting there.

I understand there is the Center, and we have had some briefing in it, but I await more specific instructions.

Our faculty is scheduled to visit the Center later in the month and make recommendations.

Yes - An addition is being added to my building and I hope to set up such a center in the addition.

Several teachers have been to the Center for seminars.

Hope to utilize facilities in teacher training and in-service development.

Principal and teacher will visit Center, study machines and make loans of various media.

As the need arises. We are planning an innovative program of individualized reading instructions.

If a list of activities are sent.

In future planning, I will hold a faculty meeting at the Center to expose my teachers to available services.

Plan to send grade chairmen, special teachers, and individual teachers to workshops, training sessions, programs, etc. to enrich teaching instruction within the building.

To obtain teacher training assistance. To keep up with newest materials available and to make use of exchange materials.

I hope to have my staff visit there.

We have asked to have Project 470 continued. Also, the television proposal will begin in September.

Aid in training staff in use of educational resources center we hope to establish in our school.

Non-Participating Principals - Question #2 (continued)

To inaugurate a center at Richardson School.

I would expect to use the resources extensively.

Arrange for teachers to visit, to attend workshops, or to get materials or information.

Utilize facilities; gain help from resource people.

1) To explore machines and materials available to enrich program.
2) To gain knowledge and assistance with photography and to further individualize instruction.

Designate two teachers as coordinators between ERC and our school.

I would like to find out more about available services.

Study materials.

Having teachers visit the Center; also, contacting the personnel for possibly starting a center here in school.

Hope to use materials and equipment.

Hopefully, ERC personnel will be available for use in conducting workshops, etc., as a part of staff development.

1) As a resource center for our staff.
2) As a consultant and resource for planning a centennial.

To operate new media.

The offerings of the Center are expected to be exposed to my faculty.

Plan sessions with faculty.

Question #3 - Have you received any materials or publications from the Center?

We received a notice of the opening data and invitations to a workshop.

Bulletin distributed at Open House at Bunker Hill by Mr. Webb and Mrs. Carter.

Announcements of the location and services.

Announcement of availability.

Flyer - describing services briefly.

Budget matter noted above.

Available materials there.

Only flyer announcing that it was there.

A circular explaining its fucntions.

I received a description of available materials and brochures.

Flyer describing services offered by ERC.

Software and hardware.

I brought publications back with me when I attended the meeting.

Information flyer.

Yes, received it in an orientation period.

The information sheet listing uses of the Center.

Hoffman Reader, Craig Reader, Greeley Booth - for Project 456.

Information booklet.

Instructional center.

Circulars on equipment.

Received only one brochure.

Brochures announcing the Center's new location and resources available. Material related to a programmed learning experiment with pre-school children.

1) Social studies units
2) Publishers' materials

Non-Participant Principals - Question #3 (continued)

Presented by Director in class - curriculum materials.

Newsletters.

Brochure on DC ERC.

Question #4 - Have you heard anything about the idea of creating an educational resources center in every school? What is the position of the person in charge?

Librarian.

Librarian.

Librarian - very much interested - we need additional machines and help with room wiring.

Will be librarian.

Hope to set up one in new addition. In our plans, the librarian will be in charge.

English teacher.

Librarian attempts to handle visual-education material.

Librarian.

Librarian.

Librarian.

Reading Improvement Teacher and Remedial Reading Teacher.

Teacher of English as a Second Language.

Librarian.

We are in an old building at this time. We expect to go into our new building in September 1968. Then we hope to establish one.

No one in charge - materials are being acquired.

Librarian - Science Teacher.

New school - plans incomplete as to utilization of library.

I want one very much and very soon. I would expect the librarian to be in charge. The "fetch and carry" person should be an aide.

Librarian.

Librarian.

Librarian (needs assistance to staff educational resources center. Impossible for one librarian to cover adequately both positions).

Very small - no person in charge.

Librarian.

Librarian.

For a very small one - the librarian is trying to help us build one.

Question #5 - To the best of your knowledge, has anyone in your school (other than you) had continuing contact with the Educational Resources Center and its activities?

Librarian - no depth.

A representative group of four teachers from each building has visited Bunker Hill Center. Librarian visited ERC and Bunker Hill.

English and Social Studies teachers attended several workshops.

The Reading Specialist of the English Department of the school has had regular contact.

Most of my teachers have used it.

Not continuing. However, each staff member who desired was permitted to go on school time.

Assistant Principal was formerly with the Center.

Visit to Davis School Resource Center by Mrs. Elaine Johnson.
Visit to City Resource Center by teachers in charge of Davis School Center and teachers involved in in-service program of the D.C. Public Schools (Individualized Instruction).

Complete faculty and teacher aid received training at the Center.

Miss Birdie Rogers has been acting as a liaison.

Teachers doing research for Project SCOPE have used it.

Teachers who took a workshop, "Individualization of Instruction," visited centers as part of their course.

Faculty had meeting last week.

The Vice-Principal.

Intermittent contact (English Department).

Mr. Martin N. Schulman, Audio-Visual Coordinator.

Two teachers have attended meetings at the Center to begin planning ways of implementing certain objectives of the Great Cities Language Arts Power Task Force Program. The meetings are on released time with paid substitutes.

Language Arts Resident Teacher.

Non-Participant Principals

Question #6 - Do you have any impression of the present purpose or function of the Educational Resources Center?

Not clear or specific in terms of scope or depth. (1. Staff development; 2. Multi-media)

A center where multi-media are housed. Uncertain as to personal availability - procedure for securing, etc.

To train teachers in the use of material and equipment. To allow teachers the opportunity to see material that may be purchased for use in the school.

To make educational media available for training purposes.

Purpose: To acquaint teachers with new materials and educational technology designed to improve the instructional program.

No, but I probably should.

To provide a means whereby interested personnel may be acquainted with the various types of hard- and soft-ware available for instructional purposes. Assist those who wish to do a project or make up new instructional aids and materials for classroom use.

A vague impression. Place to see new materials (hardware and software).

More innovative materials are being introduced.

I understand it is supposed to be involved in staff development, but I have seen very little of it.

Certainly it must be to provide materials and information to those involved in the teacher of children. What possible other reason could there be?

Yes, but vague.

The circular helped. The tour helped.

To supplement and improve the total instructional program in the area of individualized instruction and other innovative techniques.

We feel that the Resources Center is offering a much needed service to the classroom teacher. They are creating an interest in new innovations in the field of education.

It is a functioning aid to those who avail themselves of its services.

To examine and research innovative materials.

To keep the schools informed of the latest resource materials and equipment in education.

Information on flyer.

Specific staff development. Training in use of educational hardware. Production of some educational aids.

As the name implies, it should be a resource more complete and sophisticated than the individual school center.

Staff development, research facility, training facility, source of information, materials, equipment, new ideas, etc.

Operation seems to be in planning and acquisition stages - unready to give comprehensive service.

Help teachers improve their ability to teach through the introduction of new techniques and methods (innovation).

It can be valuable. More publicity about available services is needed.

Training teachers in use of materials, etc.

In changing the curriculum and its impact on individual learning, it is necessary to change the instructional resources with which he interacts.

The purpose has been publicized.

To provide for teachers the means to use media equipment and special resources in classroom for improving the quality of teaching.

The purpose seems to be that of providing in-service training for teachers and school officers.

1) A source for new and innovative curricular materials, their use and development. 2) To train teachers in the use of educational technology and materials for individualizing instruction.

To demonstrate educational technology and show how it may be used for instructional purposes.

To explain and expose teachers to the latest media.

1) Staff development. 2) Innovative teaching media.
To exhibit for educators (teachers, administrators, teaching aides) current educational media)programmed instructing audio-visual aids, innovative materials for individualization of instruction.

Not clearly.

Non-Participant Principals

Question #8 - Indicate any suggestions that you might have as to how the usefulness of the ERC to the Washington schools might be improved during the coming year.

Planning programs must be with and not for the persons to participate. Regional ERC should be established. It's not practical to have complete ERC's in each building. It isn't necessary. However, some aspects of ERC should be in each building. This should be decided by the staff in the field.

Staff development is our single most important need.

I hope that built into this ERC concept will be the guarantee that persons making decisions do not go "out of their fields."

The ERC concept could be very helpful to the improvement of education for the children if we make decisions in terms of children's needs.

Located in a more accessible location or decentralized in more available areas. Delivery service such as now exists in audio-visual aid service or public library service - teachers order material, material delivered to and collected from schools.

1) The materials at the ERC should be in sufficient quantity to allow teachers to borrow materials and use them with their classes.
2) Teachers who attend a workshop at the Center should be given research time to participate, or be paid for their time if it is after school hours or on Saturday.
3) The ERC should be more centrally located for easier access by teachers and other staff members.

ERC has really had very little impact on this school in terms of reaching out and offering help to teachers. Materials available at ERC which are then not accessible to the teacher in the classroom only causes frustration. Can it be a true lending library among other things? How will it sell its services to teachers? Can demonstrations be brought into the school?

ERC teachers must be made available for the establishment of centers in individual schools.

Some backing by ERC is necessary for acquiring of requested materials and room improvements in individual schools for centers.

ERC personnel and program must be more available to the classroom teacher. The program and offerings need better publicity throughout our school system.

Make available to schools the services of technicians during the planning or setting up of the center.

I cannot give a really fair evaluation because the specific problems of my school plus the recent disturbances have so absorbed my time that I have not been able to explore the ERC.

Non-Participant Principals - Question #8 (continued)

Haven't worked with them enough to be able to make such recommendations. The limited contact that I have had with them, they have been very helpful and really want to help the teacher. The problem is to get the teachers to avail themselves of the opportunity and facilities.

I would like to see both general and intensive involvement of teachers and officers in the development of new and innovative curriculum materials and in the training of teachers in the use of educational technology.

I can tell you more next year.

There should be several centers in each section of the city which are easily accessible for teachers.

1) Open Center on Saturdays, and extend evening week-day time for convenience of teachers who are located on the periphery of the city and wish to use the facilities of the Center to prepare instructional materials.
2) Due to the fact that the location of the Center is far removed from the majority of the schools, provision should be made for workshops in the various buildings that request this service.
3) Make their materials available on a lending basis to the resource personnel in the individual schools.
4) Publish a catalog or brochure of available materials.
5) As new materials are available, inform the principals through news letters, flyers or other forms of communication.

Bulletin should be issued. Their personnel should work more closely with teachers. Teachers should have released time to go there for study and training.

1) Provide parking facilities at the Center.
2) Send representatives to the schools regularly to demonstrate equipment and hold workshops.

Changing (a) location; (b) days of week; (c) hours open.

Investigate available research to ascertain the actual usefulness of some of the innovative materials and procedure balanced against the effect on children of a large number of instructors in a semi-departmental set-up such as we seem to be heading for. To evaluate, that is, the need for aides, specialists, and hardware versus the highly trained teacher whose skills are sharpened by the resources of the ERC, including the use of educational technology.

Parking facilities should be provided.
Posters prominently advertising hours of business should be distributed to schools.

Provide parking. Free materials for schools.

Non-Participant Principals - Question #8 (continued)

The main problem now is lack of parking space. A teacher, or any visitor should be able to go there at any time and be able to park close by. If this problem is not solved, teachers simply will not get into the habit of going there.

1) Direct contact with each school.
2) Publicizing their services and materials.
3) Doing field work with children and teachers.

Too remote at present to serve individual buildings and staff members.

In-service training on released or paid time would assist teachers.

Coordinators to relate opportunities in ERC to each building.

We need help in the schools, not in a Center.

Provide released time (with paid substitute teaching service) for one primary and one intermediate teacher from each elementary school to participate in workshop training sessions at the DC ERC.

It is useless to talk about ERC in a school too crowded to provide rooms for pupils and teachers.

Proposal for closed circuit TV in Model School Division should be given full attention.

In over-crowded sections, provide an Area Center to serve several nearby schools. Have center fully equipped for use there and for lending for use in the respective buildings.

Expansion of physical facilities and amount of equipment available.

During the next school year, the ERC will need to project itself and bring more teachers in for work sessions that involve less talking and more doing. Teachers must be able to leave the Center with something tangible and useful. (Making models and other teaching devices, learning to operate equipment, etc.

The machines that are on display are new and beautiful, but are not within reach of anyone's budget. The Center should include the standard film and film-strip projectors as well as the newer technology. They (the teachers) also need to see and learn to use the opaque and overhead projectors. With on-the-spot instruction, teachers could learn how to make best use of materials in their buildings.

Early in the year, ERC might try a workshop to instruct teachers in the use of cameras for taking pictures for development as 2x2 slides. Our teachers need to develop and to extend their creativity. Many new teachers depend too heavily on commercial materials which often lack relevancy.

Non-Participant Principals - Question #8 (continued)

Would it be possible and practical for the ERC to establish a bank of 2x2 slides, films, and/or video tapes showing good examples of functional educational resource centers in schools? This would help a faculty achieve a better idea of how such a center might function in their own situation.

1) Departments could plan workshops (similar to the Social Studies workshop) demonstrating and using materials and machines of various subject matter areas or units or lesson plans.
2) Supervisors and/or principals could plan together with the teachers at the Center and work out unit or lesson plans.

I could only give suggestions if it would be decentralized in the future. An experimental school should be associated with the Center to try out new materials and equipment under controlled conditions.

Appendix 6

Teacher Responses to Passow Study Questionnaire
(Washington, D. C. Teacher Study, Columbia University,
Bureau of Applied Social Research, January, 1967).

Percent of Teachers Reporting Participation, and
Percent of Participants Reporting, "Very Helpful"
In-Service Training Activities during 1965 and 1966(1)

Type of Activity	Per cent Participating			Per cent Reporting "Very Helpful"		
	El(2)	JHS(3)	HS(4)	El	JHS	HS
Staff Committee Meetings	43	46	48	23	22	21
Curriculum Study	38	26	24	32	38	38
Lectures	42	42	40	21	24	18
Demonstration Lessons	56	38	30	38	39	37
Courses (Museum, etc.)	10	9	7	50	44	57
Observing other teachers	52	30	16	40	43	63
Summer Institute	19	20	20	53	55	65
DCTC	26	26	16	58	58	63
Courses other colleges	20	27	29	65	63	59

---

(1) Question 37, page 12 of Passow Study Questionnaire.

(2) N = 3142

(3) N = 1439

(4) N = 944

Per cent of Teachers Spending One or More Hours per Week in In-Service Training (as of January 16, 1967)(1)

	Elementary	Junior High School	Senior High School
Per cent	46	39	36
Total No.	3142	1439	944

---

(1) Question 34, page 10 of Passow Study Questionnaire

Per cent of Teachers Who Would Like to Spend Less or More Time on In-Service Training (as of January 16, 1967)(1)

	Elementary	Junior High School	Senior High School
Less	3	3	4
More	24	26	25

---

(1) Question 34, page 10 of Passow Study Questionnaire